

Robert W. Ralston, and
Arthur Bernstein.

Paymaster Elijah H. Cope to be a pay inspector with the rank of commander, for temporary service.

Acting Pay Clerk Samuel L. Bates to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

Assistant Paymaster James Wilson, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service:

Claude C. Hanan,
Charles E. Leavitt,
Harrison W. McGrath,
Harry C. Mechtoldt,
Henry J. Taylor,
Charles W. Fox,
William S. Cooper,
Archie B. McKay,
Josephus M. Lieber,
George J. Schoonover,
Otto E. Matheny, and
Everett W. Brown.

The following-named assistant paymasters of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service:

Forrest F. Fulton and
John W. Mears.

The following-named officers to be assistant naval constructors with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service:

Herman R. Newby,
Lott C. Newton, and
Goldsboro Sessions.

Carpenter Emerson W. Amos to be an assistant naval constructor with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William N. Eichorn, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant naval constructor with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade), on the retired list, to be lieutenants on the retired list, for temporary service:

Alvah M. Smith,
Charles C. Beach,
Jesse E. Jones,
John Westfall,
Charles G. Wheeler,
William G. A. Schwerin,
Henry Feehan,
John L. Kelley,
Herbert J. Wiseman,
Edgar A. Robie,
Arthur Rogier,
Edmund H. Klamt,
William C. Stauffer,
Norman McIntire,
Daniel R. Shackford, and
James Munro.

POSTMASTER,
MICHIGAN.

Cornelius A. Bates, Marine City.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 15, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts unto Thee, O God our Heavenly Father, from whom cometh all strength, wisdom, and purity. Impart unto us, we beseech Thee, of these things sufficient unto our needs, that with all diligence and perseverance we may do whatsoever we are called to do, with unswerving fidelity to truth and justice. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, what does the gentleman want to talk about for 10 minutes?

Mr. McFADDEN. I have a bill and a resolution that I am presenting this morning, in connection with a couple of matters which I should like to call to the attention of the House. I think the matter is rather important.

Mr. FOSTER. Can not the gentleman get along with five minutes?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will try to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to proceed for not more than five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill and joint resolution which I have offered are as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15983) to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency and the office of Comptroller of the Currency, and authorizing the Federal Reserve Board to perform the duties thereof.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency in the Treasury Department, and the office of Comptroller of the Currency be, and they are hereby abolished, except as hereinafter provided in this act.

SEC. 2. That the duties now imposed by law upon the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency and upon the Comptroller of the Currency shall hereafter be performed under and by direction of the Federal Reserve Board; and all employees of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency now provided for by law shall be transferred to and hereafter be under the control and direction of the Federal Reserve Board, which board shall also disburse all appropriations for salaries and for other expenses of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency and shall submit detailed estimates in its next annual report of the number of employees, their salaries, and of other necessary expenses for the administration of the duties hereby imposed upon it by said board.

SEC. 3. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent or in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

House resolution 578.

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a select committee of seven Members of the House, and that such committee be instructed to inquire into the official conduct of John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of the Currency, in his capacity as such comptroller, in the relationship thereof not only to the functions of said office as prescribed by law and by regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury and by said Williams, but also in his official relationships to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of War, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to the Federal Reserve Board, to the War Finance Corporation, to the Capital Issues Committee, to the United States Shipping Board, and to the Emergency Fleet Corporation, respectively; said committee shall also inquire whether said Williams has any private banking connections or partnerships or otherwise interested in banking or brokerage concerns in the cities of Richmond, Va., or Baltimore, Md., or both, and what connection any or all of these have had in the past year with purchases or sales of stocks in International Mercantile Marine and Russian bonds or other securities, if any fiduciary or other relationship exists or has existed between such banks and the Richmond Federal reserve bank or its branch at Baltimore, Md. Said committee shall also inquire into the official conduct of said John Skelton Williams in his official capacity as Director of Finance and Purchases of the United States Railroad Administration. Said committee shall also inquire into the acquisition of sites for naval operations of any kind and report to the House whether, in their opinion, the said John Skelton Williams, while in said office of Comptroller of the Currency or in an official capacity directly, indirectly, or ex officio in connection with any other governmental office, commission, board, or agency, has been guilty of acts which were designed or calculated to overthrow, subvert, or corrupt the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof; and whether the said John Skelton Williams has been guilty of any act, or has conspired with others to do acts, which, in contemplation of the Constitution, are high crimes or misdemeanors, requiring the interposition of the constitutional powers of this House; and for such purposes said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and administer oaths, and shall have the right to report at any time.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I desire to take these few minutes to call the attention of the House to a bill and a resolution that I am putting in this morning. One is to abolish the office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the other calls for an investigation of that bureau. I am prompted to do this because of several reasons. One of them comes in the form of a copy of a letter from John S. Fisher, the commissioner of banking of the State of Pennsylvania, to Richard L. Austin, agent of the Federal reserve bank at Philadelphia. He says:

A matter just came to my attention yesterday which I feel justified in mentioning to you. One of the trust companies of the State has been a depository for a number of years for one of the important railroad systems operating in the region. An officer of this company informs me that the Comptroller of the Currency has notified him that unless steps are taken by the 1st of February to convert the company into a national bank the railroad deposits will be removed to a national bank.

It seems to me that this is an unfortunate circumstance, and doubly so if it forecasts a fixed policy on the part of the comptroller. In the recent Government financial operations I am quite certain that the State institutions have done their full patriotic duty, just the same as the national banks. We are advised that there are to be further flotations of loans by the Government, and it seems to me untimely for the Government authorities to exercise any discrimination against the State institutions. If friction should arise as a result of such governmental policy, it is not difficult to anticipate that pressure may be brought to bear upon the State authorities to retaliate by removing State deposits to State institutions. In the past there has been no discrimination in this respect.

In addition to that I want to quote a letter from a banker who has this to say in regard to a similar situation just like I

have outlined here in regard to the transfer of the deposits of the Railroad Administration from trust companies and State banks to national banks in an attempt to force State banks and trust companies into the Federal Reserve System. I quote:

It's going to be hard on us if he should move these deposits from the moral effect, for we have had this account for 15 years without a complaint, and if the account is moved the bank will advertise it and try to slur us, and the public will naturally start to inquire why was the account moved, which would not be hard to explain, but hard to convince the public, but something must be wrong or else the account would not be moved. We would be glad to put up securities or do anything that would satisfy the Government that the deposits in this company were just as secure as they are in any national bank, but this won't satisfy Mr. Williams. We must nationalize. We trust companies must help finance the Government's loans by buying certificates and bonds, join the Federal reserve bank, but receive no favors. Does this look right?

It seems to me that if this practice is carried out to any great extent it will mean a disrupting of our financial system in the United States and is a power and an influence over State banks and trust companies which should not be exercised by the director of finance of the Railroad Administration or the Comptroller of the Currency acting in this dual capacity.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I have only five minutes, and I have quite a good deal that I should like to say. This banker that I have just quoted has been to Washington, and he has consulted with the Comptroller of the Currency and the director of finance of the Railroad Administration, and they have practically made an effort to persuade him that if he would go back home and get his board of directors to convert his institution into a national bank or come under the Federal supervision they would continue the deposits.

Now, the laws in Pennsylvania are such at the present time that many of the trust companies do not feel that they have the legal standing that they should have, and some controversy is now taking place regarding amendments in our State legislature to unify and make possible closer relations between State banks and the national system, but such action as this, however, disrupts any getting together.

Mr. GARNER. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman's bill proposes, as I gather from the proposition at the other end of the Capitol, to abolish the office of Comptroller of the Currency and turn its duties over to the Federal reserve bank?

Mr. McFADDEN. That is one of the purposes.

Mr. GARNER. And according to your own argument you are interested because Mr. Williams is trying to strengthen the Federal Reserve System?

Mr. McFADDEN. He is withdrawing funds from State banks and trust companies in millions of dollars and transferring them to national banks on his own initiative, and I understand that this is a fixed policy and is being carried out deliberately.

Mr. GARNER. And doing it, as you say, for the purpose of strengthening the Federal bank system, to force them into that system. Do not you suppose some influence has been brought to bear on Mr. Williams by the Federal reserve banks to do that same thing?

Mr. McFADDEN. I do not know, but do know that he has withdrawn from one trust company tens of millions of dollars and transferred it to other banks, and they are one of the strongest and most patriotic trust companies in America. He has done this without any advance notice to them.

There are several other things in connection with this that I want to call to the attention of the House, and particularly the autocratic powers that are exercised by the Comptroller of the Currency in these matters. He is acting in a dual capacity—as Comptroller of the Currency and director of finance and purchases of the Railroad Administration. He is on the War Finance Board and the Farm Loan Board. There is an intermingling of responsibilities there which makes this power too marked.

I want also to call your attention to the fact that there have also been called to my attention cases where railroads have appealed to the finance division of the Railroad Administration for financial assistance, as provided for by recent legislation enacted by Congress, in which the revolving fund of \$500,000,000 was created, and that John Skelton Williams, as director of finance, refused to grant advances to railroads unless the trusteeship under the mortgage was changed from the regular trustee of long standing to some other trustee that was acceptable to him. This is the rankest kind of discrimination, and is a stab in the back that any reputable institution would resent which had been acting in a satisfactory way for years for any railroad or corporation and for which they had perhaps worked many years to get as a customer. If such reports are true, they are subject to the most severe criticism.

The fear and anxiety of the banks of this country are manifest everywhere. I believe that unless these banks and bankers are reassured, or that if there is a continuance of this situation, it is going to interfere seriously with the cooperation of the banks in the sale of the next liberty loan. As now operated, this is complete strangulation of the finances of the country.

The system of examinations, as they are being conducted by the comptroller, seems to me most unfortunate; and right here I want to quote from two letters which I have received from bankers. I quote:

To show that I am right in my contention that I am in "the criminal class," I wish to advise that all of our directors feel that the examiners look upon them with keenest suspicion when they are here; also that an extra examiner, who had been working in city banks, coming here about two years ago, made the remark, after he had been here about 15 minutes, that he wished us to know that he did not expect to find anything crooked in this bank.

I wish now that I had called attention in my former letter to the fact that the department requires two examinations by examiners, two examinations by the board of directors, and six reports each year, so that 10 months of the year we are going through the throes of examinations.

The reports ask for information which has no bearing whatever upon the standing of the banks, and if furnished once or twice a year at utmost would be all that would be required for statistical purposes. In lending money we think if we have two reports a year from reputable parties that we can judge as to their credit. I think the burden of details could be considerably reduced and furnish the department all that is necessary for them to know as to our condition.

The second letter is as follows:

I wish that the officers of the Treasury Department would recognize the value of securing pleasant relations between it and the bankers of the country, and thus have the cooperation that should always exist in financial affairs. You are taking the proper course to have such conditions come, and a great benefit will surely result from your action.

There is one subject you touched upon lightly which I wished to come up for discussion, but there seemed to be no proper place for it, and so I said nothing. This was in regard to opposing the reappointment of Mr. Williams Comptroller of the Currency and going a step further and having the office done away with.

I have been in banking 47 years, and up to a few years ago thought it was a reputable profession, but since the comptroller's office has adopted its present policy I have felt that I might not live long enough to get out of "the criminal class" in which we are placed.

As I understand it, Mr. Williams's reappointment would mean five years more of the present policy, and my desire for recovering standing, in my own estimation at least, is not likely to be gratified.

The law provides that the Federal reserve bank can take over the work which the comptroller's office is now performing, and I trust that the day is not far distant when they will do so, as I know the bankers throughout the country will be treated most fairly and have a chance to feel that they are respectable members of society once more.

Many of the examiners who go out all over the country are from the South. For instance, the largest number of examiners from any State come from the State of Texas, and nearly all of these bank examiners are sent out to examine northern banks. Many of them are special examiners.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes more. This is an important question.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, Mr. Speaker, we ought to go ahead with the regular business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not like to object, but I will object to anybody else. I think it is wrong to be taking up the time of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Now, in connection with my resolution to investigate the department, I hope that the Members of the House will think seriously over this matter, because there are floating around the country all sorts of rumors regarding this office and its administration under the present comptroller, and I think it is for the interest of the finances and banks of this country that these rumors should be cleared up. I am hoping, therefore, that this resolution will be given prompt and quick attention by the House of Representatives.

I need only point to the fact that during the term of office of the present Comptroller of the Currency many controversies have taken place between him and the banks and bankers all over the country. I need only to refer to the famous Riggs National Bank case and the more recent controversy with the Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, and several other instances which have been called to the attention of the House—one act recently in which the abuse by the comptroller of the Government franking privilege was called in question by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. Afterwards some correspondence was inserted in the RECORD at the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE]. It was stated at the time that it was not done for the purpose of making it frankable but to get the RECORD clear.

To make the RECORD clear, I insert now the remarks of Mr. TREADWAY and Mr. MONTAGUE, including the comptroller's letter,

and would recall also the circumstances connected with the Comptroller of the Currency in his official capacity attempting to intimidate a reputable newspaper correspondent into silence and, if possible, into oblivion. I refer to the case of Norman Robinson, of the press gallery of this House, which controversy is mentioned in the remarks of Messrs. TREADWAY and MONTAGUE, just referred to. Mr. TREADWAY said:

I asked for time to call attention to another matter worthy of the attention of this House which appears to me to be an abuse of the franking privilege on the part of the Comptroller of the Currency, when he sends out to every bank in the United States a circular of notification that he has had some sort of trouble with a newspaper correspondent and in which circular he supports his claim for reappointment and reconfirmation upon the part of the Senate.

This statement reached me this morning from an official of a bank in my district. It had a number on the envelope showing that it was the general mailing list of the Comptroller of the Currency, and I only have time to read one or two very brief sentences showing that the franking privilege is used for the personal support of the gentleman himself. It seems to me a very improper action on the part of a Treasury official. It is headed "John Skelton Williams, the Comptroller of the Currency, to-day gave to the press the following statement." And in that statement he refers to the fact that he had called to his office a newspaper correspondent whom, he says, has written matter for the press asking that he should not be confirmed. He says that—

"A memorandum had been addressed with a view of conducting a campaign to oppose the confirmation of the Comptroller of the Currency in the event of his renomination. He (the newspaper correspondent) declined to affirm or deny his authorship of the memorandum."

Has not a representative of the press a right to send to his paper such matter as he may see fit, and does the Comptroller of the Currency have the right to call that man to his office to explain such correspondence and then send under the official frank of the Treasury Department such a letter as this of personal support of himself to every bank in the United States? The gentleman from Illinois a few moments ago called attention to the clogging of the mails from the soldiers. But if the use of the frank of the Comptroller of the Currency clogs the mails in any way for his personal aggrandizement, can not he stop it and give our soldier boys a chance to hear from the folks at home? [Applause.]

Letter inserted by Mr. MONTAGUE:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,
Washington, February 1, 1919.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thank you very much for calling my attention to the complaint made by Congressman TREADWAY to-day on the floor of the House, to the effect that the Comptroller of the Currency should have sent out, in franked envelopes, a copy of his press statement of January 23, which, in the opinion of the Congressman, was not properly frankable.

It is entirely true that copies of this press statement (embodying the proposal of a certain newspaper man which was prepared with a view to conducting a propaganda against this office and the Comptroller of the Currency) were sent by mail in the ordinary Treasury envelopes which are used for the distribution of all official mail.

Evidence in my possession showed that not only the Comptroller of the Currency personally but the administration of this bureau were being wantonly, maliciously, and unjustly attacked; and I believed it was to the interest of this bureau and its effective administration that the banks—which are under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to which the regulations and instructions of this bureau are issued—should be informed as to the origin and character of the attacks which were being made upon it. In fact, I believed it to be my duty to inform the national banks of the sinister character of the efforts which were being put forth to destroy or impair the authority of and respect for the comptroller's office, which must be sustained if its service is to be effective, and if the results which it is expected to accomplish are to be secured.

The statement which was given to the press and mailed to the national banks showed that these attacks were being made deliberately and "disguised"; that the plan was to "get several bankers in on the deal"; that even the bankers who were to contribute to the expense fund were not to be told "who is to handle the publicity at the beginning"; and that everything was to be done "quietly at first." For supervising and conducting a shameless attack upon a public officer, against the integrity of whose administration the discredited newspaper man admitted he had never heard a complaint or criticism, he proposed—in the memorandum which accidentally fell into my possession—that his "charges" would be "\$250 per week."

I do not believe that your colleagues in the House of Representatives would approve or condone for one moment such tactics, and I trust they will concur in the view I take, that the subject was one which I was justified in bringing to the notice of the national banks under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency.

In view of the complaint which Representative TREADWAY has made on the floor of the House, I hope that as a matter of fairness the press statement upon which he based his complaint (a copy of which I inclose) may also be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Faithfully, yours,

JNO. SKELTON WILLIAMS.

Hon. A. J. MONTAGUE,

House of Representatives, Washington.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,
Washington, January 23, 1919.

John Skelton Williams, the Comptroller of the Currency, to-day gave to the press the following statement:

"The origin of propaganda recently started against the Comptroller of the Currency and this office is explained by a document which came into my possession accidentally within the past few weeks, a photograph of which, in the interest of decent journalism and fair play, I feel it my duty to make public.

"The document is headed 'Memorandum for Mr. ———.' The name, typewritten in the memorandum, but which I prefer not to make public now, is that of an official of a banking institution (not national) which has been under serious criticism by the comptroller's office for months past for irregular, unlawful, and discreditable practices.

"Evidence in my possession shows that this 'memorandum' was prepared by a newspaper correspondent in Washington, who was the

author of the recent stories sent out from Washington to various newspapers (to the effect that active opposition to the confirmation for a new term for the Comptroller of the Currency had been developed on the part of both Democratic and Republican Senators and criticizing the comptroller's administration) and who probably was the instigator of other articles of like tenor.

"This correspondent was sent for. He came to the Treasury last Monday and was asked whether he had sent out stories criticizing the Comptroller of the Currency. He first denied that he had done so, except to one newspaper in Buffalo, N. Y., of which he said he was the Washington correspondent; but subsequently he admitted that he had furnished the material for the story to various other newspapers in different parts of the country, including among others, the New York Tribune, the Wall Street Journal, papers in Boston, Louisville, etc.

"Although he refused to admit that he had delivered the document mentioned above to the bank official to whom it was addressed, he confessed that he had been in consultation with that official in this connection on a number of occasions and had received his criticisms of this office, and that he had been carrying on negotiations with some one whose name he refused to divulge—but who was evidently the bank official to whom the 'memorandum' had been addressed—with a view to conducting a campaign to oppose the confirmation of the Comptroller of the Currency in the event of his renomination. He declined to affirm or deny his authorship of the 'memorandum.' His refusal to disclaim may be taken fairly, under the circumstances, as confession.

"He said he had not yet received 'a nickel' for his propaganda work, but subsequently admitted that he had, within the past few weeks, gotten money as a loan from the banker to whom his memorandum was addressed and who had been secretly attacking and criticizing the Comptroller of the Currency.

"He claimed that his negotiations as to the propaganda were only under way. In response to my question whether he had ever heard any breath of criticism directed against the integrity of my administration, he declared that he had not.

"He insisted that he had not yet consummated his negotiations for conducting his 'publicity campaign' and getting newspapers to print his 'disguised' stories, although he confessed that he had already given wide circulation to the yarns he had written in the effort to injure the comptroller.

"I am a little doubtful as to whether this newspaper scribbler (a discredit to a noble profession, seeking fees to defame a Government official) or the contemptible offender with whom he was conspiring should be dignified with public notice, but I think the people should understand the nature of some of the things appearing in the newspapers, so as not to be imposed upon and in order that they may distinguish paid-for propaganda from real facts.

"The following is a copy of the 'memorandum' referred to in the foregoing statement, a photograph of which memorandum by chance, but unfortunately for its author, has come into the possession of the Comptroller of the Currency:

" 'Memorandum for Mr. ———.

" 'If reappointed and confirmed, the present Comptroller of the Currency will remain in office for five years.

" 'All that is needed is determination on the part of two or three Republican Senators. If they assume the responsibility, the Democrats are not apt to make a serious fight for Williams in the Senate.

" 'A publicity campaign should be started at once, but should be run very quietly. Several papers will print stories if the stories are handed to them disguised.

" 'Full publicity can come when the name is sent to the Senate and referred to the committee.

" 'In the meantime a story here and there would help the Senators along.

" 'Get several bankers in on the deal. Do not tell them who is to handle the publicity at the beginning. That is a matter strictly between you and me for the present, because I will want to work quietly at first, since when I have to come out in the open I will be sure to make some enemies in high places.

" 'Since the fight promises to last only a few weeks, and in handling the publicity I will be sure to incur some enemies, the charges will be \$250 a week. I am sure I can do some good work for the cause.' "

It seems to me, in connection with the investigation at the other end of the Capitol in the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee on this matter, that the attention of the House should be carefully directed to this situation.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that to continue to vest such powers in the hands of any one man is a mistake, and to continue this control will be a big factor in the future financing of the Government and its industrial and railroad situation and the many other operations as well in this country.

I call attention to the fact that rumors are floating around that the Comptroller of the Currency has used information obtained in his official capacity for speculations in stock and personal profits, and that he has not hesitated to pass the word around to the faithful. I call attention to the rumor floating around that there are many speculators among the people connected with private banks and bankers who get information from this source, and I think it well to look into the New York, Richmond, and the Baltimore connections which are either controlled by Williams or members of his family, and I would also point to the recent wild speculation in International Mercantile Marine stock while the Government was deciding what it would do with their tonnage.

I want to call attention for a moment to the make-up of the board of the War Finance Corporation. This corporation is now before the Ways and Means Committee asking for a continuance of this legislation notwithstanding that the war is over. I want to point out to the House the make-up of the board.

Clifford M. Leonard, of Chicago, is a director, known very little as a financial man but selected for some reason or other. Angus W. McLean is the political chairman of the Democratic State committee of South Carolina. Eugene Meyer, jr., of New York, is managing director of the board, and is a large stockbroker in New York. W. P. G. Harding is governor of the reserve board, and the other member is Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, in regard to the other motion, to abolish the office of Comptroller of the Currency, when during the year 1914 I had the honor of serving as president of the Pennsylvania Bankers' Association, in my annual address delivered at Cape May, N. J., I said the following:

I would speak of one particular phase of the Federal reserve act under which system the national banks are now operating, and that is the position which the Comptroller of the Currency occupies in connection with the Federal Reserve Board. It is undesirable to have a Comptroller of the Currency who is, in a sense, a subordinate officer of the Secretary of the Treasury, holding a position on the Federal Reserve Board. Such an arrangement not only gives two political appointees on the board, but gives the seat to one man, who is in a sense, the subordinate of another member of the same board. I am of the opinion that there are many reasons why nearly all the duties of the Comptroller of the Currency might better be exercised by the Federal Reserve Board than continue under the present arrangement, and I believe that were the several members of the Federal Reserve Board frankly to express themselves, they would hold the same view. The Comptroller of the Currency has extremely autocratic powers. It is probably necessary that he should have autocratic powers, but it would certainly be very much more satisfactory to bankers in general if such powers were vested in a board, rather than in one man.

As to the more or less technical reasons why the Federal Reserve Board could well assume the duties of the comptroller's office, there is no need for me to elaborate. Anyone familiar with the working of the Federal Reserve Board and the comptroller's office can see how readily the powers of the latter office could be absorbed in the work of the Federal Reserve Board, and how, unless that is done, there will, of necessity, be a large amount of duplication of work, and such duplication has not fully appeared as yet, because the Federal reserve banks have not taken up the subject of examinations very rigorously. And even now there is some question as to just how much of the information gained through the regular reports and examinations of bank examiners the various Federal reserve banks are entitled to receive. Under the act the Federal Reserve System, of 12 regional banks, has the right to make special examinations. This power has not as yet been exercised.

If the Federal reserve directors are not furnished with satisfactory information from the comptroller's department, in all probability the Federal Reserve System will itself, or through its 12 regional banks, start independent examinations to secure this information, and it would, therefore, seem, and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe, the absorbing of the comptroller's office by the Federal Reserve Board would be proper, and that the act should be so amended as to permit this being done.

Nothing since I made this statement has changed my mind except to make me more strongly convinced that the office should be abolished.

Gentlemen, under the stress of party power and war necessities, there has been conferred entirely too much power and authority in the hands of one man, and if continually exercised and resorted to can have but one end—autocratic power in a democracy. When we have won the war for democracy why should we continue autocratic power over the finances of this country? The people of this country are tired of it. [Applause.]

I will not take up further time of the House, but ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill 15835, making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] had reserved a point of order on the paragraph about the transportation of the Army. I want to call to the attention of the gentlemen of the committee that one of the reasons why the amount is so considerable is this: During the war both England and France turned over to the Government of the United States certain tonnage. It was agreed that this Government would pay for the transportation of our soldiers to the other side, and, of course, that we would also pay for the transportation of the soldiers back to this country. The respective countries have not yet come to an agreement—that is, our country and England—as to the price that was to be paid for this transportation. This country thought that the English demand was somewhat excessive, and Brig. Gen. Hines has gone to England with the view of straightening out the matter.

It will take a very large sum of money in the next fiscal year to bring back to this country 1,200,000 men, if the Army should

be reduced to that number by the beginning of the next fiscal year. Of course when the soldiers arrive on the seaboard of the United States they have to be transported over the railroad lines to the different demobilization camps, and again from those camps to their respective homes. When you undertake to carry aboard the steamships and over the railroad lines such an enormous number of men it naturally requires a large sum of money, to accomplish their transportation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has any estimate been made as to the cost of transportation on our own ships for the troops taken abroad?

Mr. KAHN. Not of troops, as I recall. But at the time of the entrance of our Government into the war the rate for carrying passengers was anywhere from \$125 to \$150 a passenger across the Atlantic.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not proposed by the British Government to charge our Government passenger rates for the transportation of troops, is it?

Mr. KAHN. That is a matter that is being worked out at this time. I do not know what the amount may be that the British Government is charging, but it is with a view of bringing about a compromise agreement as to the amount to charge for each soldier.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am informed that the British Government charged at first \$50 per man for transportation and later raised it to \$100, and then to \$150. Is that true?

Mr. KAHN. I am not informed as to that. I believe that the testimony before the committee was that no agreement had been reached, and that the entire matter was still in process of settlement; that is, both Governments are trying to reach an agreement, and no money has been paid as yet for transportation of our soldiers across the Atlantic Ocean.

I want to say in all frankness that this Government took the position that the amounts that were suggested by the English Government were rather excessive. Because a great deal of tonnage had been destroyed by the time we got into the war, the amount fixed by our Government for passenger traffic across the Atlantic was so much more than had been charged for a good many years before we did go into the war that more than that former price seemed excessive.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume the high rate that was charged by the British Government of \$150 per man, or according to what I have heard they attempted to collect from our Government, was based largely upon marine risk which would arise by reason of the transport of our troops across the sea.

Mr. KAHN. Possibly to some extent that was the cause, but the scarcity of tonnage, the absolute scarcity of ships, caused the rates to rise all over the world.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and were those ships controlled by the British Government?

Mr. KAHN. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Were they British Government ships, or were they privately owned ships subsidized by the British Government?

Mr. KAHN. They were privately owned ships, and whether they were subsidized or not I do not know. All of the English ships are privately owned.

Mr. STAFFORD. But they had been commandeered by the British Government for war purposes.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. So that they were virtually, at the time of their use by the American Government for the transportation of our troops, British Government controlled ships.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, yes; they were controlled by the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. So the claim is a claim that the British Government makes against our Government, rather than a claim that private shipowners make against the Government.

Mr. KAHN. That is very true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman furnish the committee with what proportion of this extremely large amount, \$449,000,000, was supposed to be used for transportation?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from California will yield, I have the figures here.

Mr. KAHN. I yield to my colleague from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTHONY. Of the total of \$449,000,000 it is proposed to use \$106,000,000 for the charter of vessels, \$156,800,000 for the maintenance and operation of vessels, \$31,000,000 for reimbursement for losses of chartered transports, \$27,000,000 for shore

establishments, which means debarkation and embarkation, I imagine. They want \$30,000,000 for the purchase of ships, and an item of \$5,000,000 for the purchase of harbor boats. These are the principal items which make up the big item.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any appropriation carried in the bill for the purchase of additional horses and motor trucks?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What is the need of that at this time?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have a provision, I think, for \$100,000 for the purchase of horses. We figure that the Army has perhaps sufficient horses, more than enough, and they are now selling surplus horses; but there are certain types of horses that they want to continue to buy, such as young animals for the remount stations, where we train them for a year or two until matured, and we want to keep a supply of young animals passing through.

Mr. KAHN. Besides that, the Government has agreements with the farmers who produce horses for the Government that it will take them off their hands after they obtain a certain age.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; of that type.

Mr. SNELL. That is, regardless of the number they may have on hand?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What is the provision for additional automobiles and automobile trucks carried in this bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. My understanding is that none of this money is to be used for any large purchase of automobiles or automobile trucks. They intend to develop and standardize certain types, and will probably use a small amount of the appropriation in that way, but there is a tremendous surplus of automobile trucks and automobiles.

Mr. SNELL. That is what caused me to wonder why it was necessary to buy any more.

Mr. ANTHONY. They want to experiment and standardize types, and I think the gentleman can feel assured that the department is sincere in its promise that it has no intention of making any more large purchases.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman know what is going to be done with all of these new trucks now here in the vicinity of Baltimore at the present time, and the ones that are continuing to be delivered?

Mr. ANTHONY. They will be placed in storage now.

Mr. SNELL. Are they in storage now?

Mr. ANTHONY. Gen. Goethals told the committee that he had no knowledge of the conditions that had been stated in the House by the Member from South Dakota, and that he did not believe there were any great number of trucks standing outdoors exposed to the elements that the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I have some personal knowledge of what has been done at Camp Holabird, near Baltimore, where these trucks are kept. All of the trucks that were parked there during the summer, waiting shipment or call for service, are being knocked down and boxed up and prepared for storage, and a large number of our soldiers are being used for that work, and have been for the last two months.

Mr. ANTHONY. Did I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin to make the point of order on the purchase of ships?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have reserved the point of order on the whole paragraph.

Mr. ANTHONY. It covers the item of the purchase of ships?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say to the gentleman in regard to the item of \$5,000,000 for harbor boats that I have never believed there was the slightest necessity for the appropriation for such boats, for the Navy must have hundreds of small boats and auxiliary craft that can be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. With other services like the Coast Guard Service, they come to Congress for a special authorization for additional boats.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then why should we make a blanket authorization here and make available half a billion dollars, virtually, for the purchase of transports and replacements when there are Army transports that have been used for years?

I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to his summary of the estimates. In the estimates he gave there is accounted a total of \$355,000,000 out of \$449,000,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. There are a great many other items in the bill—

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the balance of \$94,000,000 you have not accounted for to be used for?

Mr. ANTHONY. The transportation of the Army in this country runs into tremendous figures.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly give us the amounts?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is an estimate of \$5,000,000 for troops changing stations. Impedimenta and organization of property accompanying troops changing stations is a question of a million or more. I will not give the very small items, but just the larger ones.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not agree with the gentleman that \$1,000,000 is a small item.

Mr. ANTHONY. They are in these times. Transportation of recruits—

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly it is not in peace times.

Mr. ANTHONY. Transportation of recruits, \$7,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANTHONY. Transportation of applicants for enlistment, \$2,000,000; transportation subsistence stores, \$1,900,000; transportation of miscellaneous quartermaster stores, \$11,000,000; transportation of ordnance and ordnance stores and small arms, \$1,000,000. I am just giving the big items.

Mr. KAHN. What have they for railway transportation?

Mr. ANTHONY. Here is another item I overlooked, sailing of public transports, \$33,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is included under the general phrase "sailing of transports"?

Mr. ANTHONY. I imagine that covers the entire expenses of the operation of public transports.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that the Navy had that.

Mr. KAHN. The Navy furnished the crews, and the Army runs the transports and always has run the Army transports. They are called Army transports.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, this \$33,000,000 is the actual operation of Army transports and provides for fuel and maintenance of ships, whereas the personnel is furnished by the Navy and paid for by the Navy?

Mr. KAHN. In most of the transports I imagine they still have some of the old men on the transports who were there before we got into the war and who are civilians.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say further to the gentleman that, in my opinion, it is impossible to itemize all of the expenses of the return home of the troops in France, and this item is intended most largely, probably 85 per cent of it, to be devoted for that purpose, and the real facts are that regardless of the paper plans of the War Department, and even if we vote all the money carried in this bill, we are going to be called upon for a large deficiency to make up the expense of bringing back our troops in France, for the maintenance of the large number of men we know will be in France at the beginning of this fiscal year, and, in my opinion, the committee is largely wasting its time in cheeseparing or criticizing items in this bill, all of which I think are bound to be widely exceeded before we get these men back and conditions in the Army are restored to normal.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I can not place myself in the enlarged frame of mind of gentlemen on the Committee on Military Affairs and agree when I seek information as to a half-billion-dollar item and attempt to reduce it by \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000, that that is cheeseparing. I know that the Committee on Military Affairs has been living for the past two years in extravagant expenditures of billions of dollars, and the Committee on Appropriations have been lately trying to cut down those authorizations, and that is my present purpose.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that when an item of about a billion dollars comes in in next year's military deficiency, even after this money is voted, he will perhaps understand the point I am trying to make—

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I will not understand, because I will not be here, and I will not be charged with that responsibility.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Has the gentleman any information as to the basis of charges for the transportation of troops on the interned German ships?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can give the gentleman, perhaps, some information as to the status of the capacity with which we will be able to bring troops back from abroad. Col. Bettison, of the Transportation Department, tells me that we have bunk capacity in American bottoms to-day for 160,000 men, but, on account of the fact they can not make a turn around within 30 days—within a month—he says we can bring back 120,000

only each month in American ships; but they hope to be able to close arrangements with the British Government by which they will secure a capacity of about 50,000 more men, for which we are to pay, not the price that the gentleman from Wisconsin suggested, \$150 or \$170, as the English Government tried to charge us, but we are going to pay the exact cost of the service, which is to be figured out by boards which will be appointed for that purpose. Then, in addition to that, negotiations are under way for a capacity of 11,000 from the Italian Government, and it is very nearly closed—

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Monthly?

Mr. ANTHONY. Monthly. Then, we are making arrangements for 11,000 with the French Government and for a capacity of 11,000 with the Scandinavian countries, which brings the total monthly capacity to about 180,000, as I had it figured. That brings us to the question of how much capacity we are going to get from Germany. Right now boards are at work in the harbor of Bremen surveying German ships to see if we can get an additional capacity of 70,000, but I am informed we will not be able to get up anywhere near that, but that we are going to get some German capacity. Those ships will be taken to England, the German crews will be taken off, and American naval crews will be put aboard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANTHONY. And all this tonnage will give us a total capacity, in my opinion, of about 200,000 men per month with which we will be able to return troops from France. The War Department, optimistic as usual, thinks it can handle 300,000 men per month, but I believe my estimate of 200,000 per month will prove nearer right.

Let me carry this a little further and say that within the next four months we can get back over 800,000 men. That will leave us a million men in France on July 1, and there is the absolute certainty that these appropriations, as large as they are, are not going to take care of the expenses for the maintenance of our Army in France, in this country, and in our insular possessions the next fiscal year. All the criticism which has been leveled at this bill for being too lavish falls to the ground, because it is a dead certainty that, whether we want it or not, we will have more men in service next year than even this bill provides for. It is a physical impossibility that it be otherwise.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. The question is concerning these interned German ships. Who is operating them and at whose expense?

Mr. ANTHONY. The interned ships in this country are operated by the American Government now.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. By the Navy Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. By the Navy Department. This appropriation goes to pay the expense of their operation, but they are in charge of naval crews and naval commanders.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Just the actual expense of the navigation?

Mr. ANTHONY. The actual expense of the navigation and the expense of their operation.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. It is charged up against the War Department, and the War Department accounts to the Navy Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. The War Department pays the bill. We have a department of embarkation and transportation. All the Navy Department will pay will be the salaries of the naval officers and pay of the naval crews.

Mr. McKENZIE. The statement shows that the department cost per capita will be \$70 to the Navy.

Mr. SNELL. I want to get some more information in regard to these trucks. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] says they are bringing them over to near Baltimore and taking them apart and storing them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Camp Holabird was the large station on the Atlantic coast—

Mr. SNELL. I know all about that.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). For the stores of the Quartermaster's Department and the collecting point for all these automobiles that were manufactured by the respective concerns of the country where they have collected for shipment abroad. Large numbers of them were there at the time of the armistice, parked about the premises, consisting of several thousand. Those are being knocked down and put in crates so that they can be stored for future use.

Mr. SNELL. If we are knocking them down there and storing them, why do we continue to manufacture them at the present time?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is something I can not answer, and I do not see any warrant for their doing it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that on a large number of contracts there were trucks and automobiles coming there with probably a large percentage toward completion. It was not deemed wise, it was explained, to absolutely stop the work on these vehicles, and they will be probably allowed to be completed and be delivered to the Government.

Mr. SNELL. Why would it not be easier to box them up and store them where they are at the present time than to put them together and drag them to the Atlantic department and erect buildings in which to store them again?

Mr. ANTHONY. The bill carried \$50,000,000 for inland storage, which will be largely for the storage of quartermaster's supplies, where our immense surplus of material accumulated through the war contracts can be safely taken care of until they can be disposed of.

Mr. SNELL. There are several thousand of these trucks that have accumulated there at the present time. I was so informed a few days ago.

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly there has been the wildest extravagance.

Mr. CRAGO. This bill does not provide a cent for anything of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. I understood the gentleman from Kansas to say to the committee that 1,000,000 troops will be left in Europe by the 1st of July, and he nods his head in acquiescence.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the case.

Mr. FREAR. I ask the gentleman if he has heard the statement that Gen. Foch requested Gen. Pershing that 1,000,000 men remain in Europe until further directions from him?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I have not.

Mr. FREAR. I have had that brought to me, coming from Army sources, and I ask if any member of the committee has heard it or has received any information on the subject that the House can have?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is the intention of the War Department, so far as we can get it, to bring our men back as fast as they can bring them home, but it is physically impossible to get them all back before the beginning of the fiscal year, and there will be a million men of our Army in France next summer whether or no.

Mr. FREAR. If that be true, will the gentleman inform the committee why these letters that we all receive from different camps in the country that the men are not brought back, and that the officers refuse to discharge them, and state that they will put them in the guardhouse if they make those complaints? I have such statements in my pocket now.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the figures will show that the Army in this country is now being demobilized at a fairly rapid pace. The bad conditions spoken of have undoubtedly existed heretofore, but the War Department, yielding to the criticism that it has brought upon itself, is now demobilizing in this country at the rate it should have begun last November.

Mr. FREAR. Does it require the weight of criticism to have the War Department carry out its own orders?

Mr. ANTHONY. It requires, I fear sometimes, more than that. While we are on that point, I wish to say that since this debate started I have noticed the tendency of gentlemen in the House, particularly on the majority side of the Chamber, to vent their criticism of Army delinquencies on the Committee on Military Affairs. Now, this committee is certainly not responsible for the conditions pertaining to the failure to demobilize in this country as fast as should have been done and as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has set forth. Those who are attacking this bill should remember that this committee has nothing to do except to recommend legislation. We have nothing whatever to do with the executive administration of the Army and its affairs. And what is more, I want to say to gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that they should be open enough and straightforward enough in making these criticisms to place them where they properly belong, namely, on those responsible for the administration and discipline of the Army. Their President is the Commander in Chief of the Army, and their Secretary of War is the one who carries out the Executive orders.

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I want to say that he has been pointing to the opposite side of the Chamber, so that it will be understood in the House what is meant by his remarks.

Mr. ANTHONY. I want the criticisms to go where they rightfully belong.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not true that the President of the United States has asked to have these troops demobilized as quickly as possible and that the Secretary of War, in pursuance of that duty and order has transmitted that request down the line, and yet we all have in our pockets requests from men in the South in these various camps who are unable to get their discharges, and the discharges are refused by men in charge of those various camps and detachments? That is true, is it not?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. I would like to get some information about these automobiles. I have received letters and telegrams asking if they are to be sold. Can the gentleman give me any information on that subject?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think our surplus automobiles and trucks are ultimately to be disposed of. The department says it does not believe it wise to throw them all on the market at one time; that it would demoralize the automobile industry. They will probably be disposed of just as rapidly as conditions justify.

Mr. EMERSON. The gentleman has no definite information about it?

Mr. ANTHONY. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the House whether the War Department has made any effort with the manufacturers of these half-completed or almost completed automobile trucks to take them off its hands, and have the manufacturers dispose of them to the trade? That, it seems, would be a practical business proposal to get rid of this large number of trucks that were ordered for emergency war purposes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that the statement here shows that contracts for trucks and automobiles were canceled widely all over the country on November 11. The process of adjustment on these discontinued orders, of course, will go on between the heads of the department and these companies, and eventually the contracts will be settled on some equitable basis.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has not answered my inquiry. My inquiry is whether the War Department has made any effort to have the motor trucks taken back by the automobile manufacturers themselves, perhaps at a reduced price, and allow the private manufacturers to dispose of them to the commercial trade.

Mr. SNELL. It has been intimated by the manufacturers that none of these trucks are to be disposed of in the open market. I would like to know whether that is true or not.

Mr. STAFFORD. My suggestion, I believe, would be a solution in a practical way, for the manufacturers to take them rather than have them sold in wholesale quantities.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have some figures here which show the view of the Army in regard to the number of men—the average number of men—that will have to be provided for in this appropriation bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said yesterday that there was bound to be a deficit, and I understood the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to make the same statement this morning. I think the War Department should have the figures placed before the House, the figures which the department has submitted, which show that as a matter of fact the average number of men under arms during the next fiscal year will not be 500,000 men.

I have figures here, which I will ask leave to put in the Record, showing the demobilization, beginning November 11, week by week. It is shown that on February 1 there were 991,133 men demobilized. The figures up to to-day, which, however, do not include all the figures, because all these reports come in gradually—the figures for demobilization up to to-day total 1,272,000.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I would like to get these figures in, and then if I have the time I shall be very willing and glad to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield or not?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Just so I get the time to make the Army's explanation, to which I think they are entitled, I will be glad to yield to all these gentlemen.

The total demobilization up to date, so far as the reports have come in, indicate 1,272,000 men, of whom 229,000 are men who have been brought home from France. The figures for the last week of officers discharged were 5,000, making a total of 66,000 officers that have been discharged. Of the men who were brought from overseas, 39,620 were brought last week; that is, the week ending February 7. I have the figures here of to-day,

but they are imperfect. I will take the next perfect figures, which are 39,620, which make 215,749 men. Here is a chart showing the progress made.

Now, Gen. March stated before the committee, and the statement was also made by other officers before the committee, that the demobilization was necessarily very slow in the beginning. It was very slow because they have been bringing home the wounded men, and they can not bring them home with the same rapidity, because they can not bring the same number of men in a vessel. They are also going to get increased facilities by the use of the German ships and by the use of a German port, where they can be very much more readily loaded.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Of course, that applies to the troops in France. But what is the reason given for not demobilizing the troops in this country?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They demobilized 85,000 last week.

Mr. GARNER. But even if they did demobilize 85,000 last week, that still leaves 700,000 here. They gave out the statement some time ago that in 30 days' time they would demobilize all the soldiers who were in this country. That statement was made by Gen. March or some other officer before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I do not understand it.

Mr. GARNER. I have never found anybody able to give the explanation why they do not demobilize all troops in this country.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Of course, the gentleman from Texas must realize that to demobilize the troops in this country every one must first be examined, and that takes a long time.

Mr. GARNER. He made that statement, and, having made it, why should he not do it?

Mr. DENT. He was making a too optimistic statement.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Is there not a fear entertained that too rapid demobilization would flood the labor market?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No. All the officers, including Gen. March and the Secretary of War and all the men who have in charge the demobilization business, every one of them, makes the positive statement that they are demobilizing just as fast as they can possibly do so.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman does not believe that, so far as this country itself is concerned, does he?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I have nothing to go by except the statements of the officers who are in charge of it.

Mr. EMERSON. Can the gentleman tell us how many have been demobilized in this country?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. One million two hundred and seventy-two thousand have been demobilized.

Mr. EMERSON. I understand that something over 200,000 have been brought back.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Two hundred and twenty-nine thousand have been brought back from France.

Mr. EMERSON. Have they been demobilized?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They have been demobilized.

Mr. EMERSON. Does that include the wounded?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; that includes all those who have been brought back from France who could be demobilized.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman stated that up to date 66,000 officers had been discharged from the service. What is the total number of officers remaining in the service? I ask that so as to show the proportionate number who have been discharged since the armistice.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. About 175,000.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The gentleman from Vermont says about 175,000. The gentleman from Wisconsin will have to ask some of the older members of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has not those figures?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No; I have not. As I say, the statements of the officers before this committee were that the Army would be demobilized just as rapidly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The statements of the officers before the committee and to me personally were that they proposed to bring back the soldiers from France, without regard to the army of occupation or without regard to any sort of obligation that now exists, just as rapidly as they possibly can, and that they have a reasonable expectation of bringing home 300,000 a month.

Mr. EMERSON. Who says that?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Gen. McIntyre told me this morning, and Gen. March made a statement before the committee to that effect.

Mr. EMERSON. Has the President been consulted?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The President gets his information from the same source that we do—from Gen. March, the Chief of Staff.

Mr. EMERSON. The President is Commander in Chief of the Army, and I would rather take his word than that of some subordinate.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. He takes the word of the same men that we do, and gets his information through the Chief of Staff.

The wounded men in France are to be brought back first—the men who are in the hospitals. The wounded men and the men who are sick will be brought back before the other soldiers are brought back. On the 1st day of July, as the gentleman from Kansas has said, according to the figures of the War Department, there will be in France 625,000 men. Of the men in the camps, there will be 400,000, making a total on the 1st of July of 1,025,000 men.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I did not quite get the figures. How many do the department say will be in France on the 1st of July?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Six hundred and twenty-five thousand.

Mr. MANN. That is based on the idea of bringing back 300,000 a month?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They estimate that they will bring back this next month 200,000, and then in the succeeding months will bring back 300,000 each month.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman whether he believes that will be done?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; I do. I have no reason to doubt it. Gentlemen may laugh, but I do not understand on what theory they do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Merely on past experience; that is all.

Mr. DYER. In the demobilization of the men in this country, or in the bringing back of the men from the other side, have they kept their promises in any case?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. This last week they brought back 30,000, and each week is now showing an increase. They are beginning to secure additional facilities by which they can bring these men back. The only thing I can go by is the statement made by the officers in charge, and certainly the Committee on Military Affairs is justified in having confidence in the statements made by the highest officers of the Army.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. There is one means of bringing them back that I do not believe has been referred to. The gentleman will recall that it was stated to us that they were changing over certain cargo ships and putting on temporary construction that would enable them to bring soldiers back in cargo ships.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. That would increase the facilities somewhat each month. It is hoped to do that.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Not only that, but they hope to increase the available ships in other ways. As I say, they are going to get certain of the German ships, by which they propose to bring back these men. Now, if you start out with a million men in the Army on the 1st day of July, and demobilize them at the rate of 300,000 a month, and enlist at the rate of 25,000 a month under the authority that we give in this act, you will find that the average number of soldiers during the 12 months from the 1st of July, 1919, to the 1st of July, 1920, will approximately be about 325,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. We had 3,700,000 men in the Army when the armistice was signed.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Somewhere near 4,000,000 men.

Mr. MADDEN. We have only discharged some 1,200,000 men so far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. That would leave some 2,500,000 men in the Army to-day.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; but they are discharging them now as fast as possible.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman says that we will reduce them to a million men by the 1st of July. Are we reducing them in any such proportion?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. We are not now, but after we get the ships the War Department calculates to get we will.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not need any ships to discharge the men in this country.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No; but they will keep up the average.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman said they were discharging them at the rate of 30,000 a day, but the figures that he gives makes it a little less than 15,000 a day.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The highest week of discharges was just before Christmas.

Mr. MADDEN. If they did not discharge more than 15,000 a week, and the same on the other side, we will have more than a million men in the Army on the 1st of July.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman—I am not sure that I caught it correctly—that the basis on which they start is a million men on the 1st of July. According to the gentleman's figures, the average would be 335,000, and that is a different table from the one published in the hearings.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. What we did was to be certain we were appropriating for a sufficient number and obviate the possible deficiency which the gentleman pointed out to us might occur.

Mr. MANN. The table in the hearings, on page 92, in the statement by Gen. Lord, starts with a million men on the 1st of July and makes out an average of 500,000 men. This is a more recent table, is it?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. These are figures that I got this morning from the War Department.

Mr. MANN. These are the newer figures.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; figures brought down to date.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit this suggestion: I think my colleague was stating the difference between the tables, and that while the decrease in the Army is going on we are increasing enlistments by 25,000 men.

Mr. MANN. This takes that into account. The figures give an average of 500,000 men, and the gentleman seems to think by the addition of 25,000 men a month it would reduce it to 335,000.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am trying to make the distinction between the two tables.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The men in the service, which anybody can figure out on the 1st of July, will be a million men according to the statement of the War Department. Of course, we can discount that, but the military officers came before the committee and we had to go by some guide, and we could only be guided by these statements of the men who had charge of these matters—Gen. March and Gen. McIntyre—men who have the whole Army's interest in their keeping.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I was struck by almost the last statement that the gentleman made before he was interrupted, that the week of the highest demobilization was just before Christmas.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; just before Christmas.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. In this country?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; in this country. I think they tried to get the men home for Christmas.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. How much was the demobilization last week?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I have not got the full figures for last week, but the week before it was 78,000. This week, so far as reported, it is 32,000; but I understand that the figures when they come in will carry it up to the average.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What was the demobilization the week before Christmas?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The highest week that they had? One hundred and ninety-four thousand men.

Mr. KNUTSON. And the War Department is saving the balance for next Christmas. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That may be a witticism, but I am trying to give these facts and figures.

Mr. MAYS. I understood the gentleman to say that the average was 335,000 men.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. According to the figures given here.

Mr. MAYS. You are appropriating for an average of 500,000 men.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. We could not tell; we are doing the best we can with the figures before us.

Mr. MAYS. Did the gentleman's committee consider limiting the appropriation so that it would compel the reduction?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have been frequently interrupted, and I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAYS. The gentleman has not answered my question. Has the committee considered the proposition of so limiting the appropriation that it would compel the reduction of the forces in accordance with the wishes of Congress?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They are compelled by the terms of the enlistment. The other day I started to put before the House the statute, but I did not have it in my hand at that time.

Here is the statute under which these men are held:

That the service of all persons selected by draft and all enlistments under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, shall be for the period of the war unless sooner terminated by discharge or otherwise.

That is followed up by another provision that says that whenever the treaty of peace is signed they must be returned to this country within four months.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I do not think the gentleman quite caught the point of the question of the gentleman from Utah. The question propounded was why we were appropriating for 500,000 when the revised figures show there are only about 350,000 men?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. These are not revised figures, but brought down to date.

Mr. DENT. I wanted to make this suggestion: Is it not a fact that the figures which the gentleman has read to the House, which he has just recently secured from the War Department, limit it to the line of the Army, and, in addition to that, there is an enlisted staff corps?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No; I think this shows all.

Mr. KAHN. Has it not been the gentleman's experience on the Committee on Military Affairs that the War Department is inclined to be rather optimistic as to what it can accomplish? For instance, they had the statement of the Secretary of War that he would build 22,000 airships in one year, and we have not built 2,000.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. What I desire to get in concrete form is this: Even though the figures of the War Department may be optimistic, there is provision made for that optimism by the difference between 335,000 and 500,000, and, according to figures which I think are entitled to respect on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs and the committee of the House, they will have on the 1st of July 1,000,000 men under arms, and if they reduce that at the rate of 300,000 men by demobilization every month and increase it by enlistment of 25,000 a month, we will not have over 335,000 men in the service.

Mr. MANN. That is, on the average?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. On the average. I do not wish these figures that I have made here to be considered as revised figures. They are just the estimates I have made from the figures that the War Department gave me this morning. These figures are on the demobilization. I got them from the War Department this morning.

Mr. MANN. I mean showing the average in the Army.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Here is the way those figures were obtained—

Mr. MANN. Are these the figures that the gentleman just described as having been obtained from the War Department or are they an estimate of his own?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Virtually an estimate. I went over them with one of the men in the staff office.

Mr. MANN. Does the staff office indorse the idea that the average for the Army will only be 335,000?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They said that that was what they hoped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. According to the statements given to us in the testimony before our committee and according to the statements that any man on this floor can get from the Chief of Staff, there is reasonable expectation, very reasonable expectation, that the average number of men under arms during the next fiscal year would be less than 500,000 men. The Members of the House must take into consideration that this appropriation does not go into effect until July 1 next. The appropriations that we have made for 1918 carry the troops up to the 1st of July, 1919, and they will be paid out of an appropriation already made. Therefore we are appropriating for an average of 500,000 men from the 1st day of July next. Immediately upon the declaration of peace these men are entitled under this law to their discharge. No one can say when that declaration of peace will be made, and that provision not only applies to the regular force but it applies to the National Guard. The National Guard was a supplementary force that was provided by the national-defense act in addition to the Regular Army, and very few States have organized the National Guard. The temporary army provided for in this bill is the force that we intend to raise in order to enable the States to reorganize their National Guard, and to enable the Army to be recruited under the national-defense act to the number of 175,000 men.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman speaks of the National Guard. I want to ask him if it is not a fact that the National Guard on the border of Mexico, in service for many months there, to-day are over in Germany, and that there is no possibility of their being returned, and whether they are not the army of occupation? Why is it that the National Guard, the members from Michigan, Wisconsin, the Rainbow Division, are held there and not brought home?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They are being brought home just as rapidly as the ships can be furnished.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not true that they have taken the other officers and soldiers—

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They are bringing home the wounded men first, as I have said, any they are bringing the men home just as rapidly as ships can be had—at the rate of 40,000 a week now, with a reasonable prospect of 300,000 a month.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I must decline to yield.

Mr. FREAR. I want to know if any order has been made retaining the National Guard of the various States in the army of occupation, and when they will be discharged?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I am not advised of the orders of the Army. I am not in the confidence of the General Staff. I take it for granted that they have no prejudice against the Rainbow Division or any other division. They are securing ships just as rapidly as they can. They are bringing the men home now at the rate of 40,000 a week, and they will bring them home at the rate of 300,000 a month. That is all the Committee on Military Affairs knows, and that is on the information and statements of officers who are experienced and trusted.

If we can trust men's lives over there in Europe to these officers, I can not imagine why we could not trust them in making estimates for the Army they may need temporarily. As I say, with the declaration of peace, with a small number expected, all in the Army will be entitled to discharge by the terms of their enlistment and the statute I have read. We propose under this bill to allow the Army to be recruited up to the strength of the national-defense act. We go right back to the national-defense act. This committee is standing by that act. We provide for a temporary army in addition to the 175,000 men authorized by the national-defense act. Temporarily, in the period of unrest, in the period of uncertainty, we have provided for this temporary army under temporary enlistments, under a temporary appropriation, to hold the situation until we can reorganize the Army on a permanent basis and the States can reorganize their National Guard. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The following tables contain the figures to which I referred in my remarks:

DISCHARGES OF ENLISTED MEN SINCE NOVEMBER 11, BY WEEKS.

The figures for recent weeks are subject to revision, as reports are still incomplete.

Daily reports received through February 5 bring the total enlisted men discharged to 1,025,093.

Source of information: Miscellaneous Division, Adjutant General's Office.

Discharges to February 1.

Week ended—	Weekly.	Cumulative.
Nov. 23.....	5,571	5,571
Nov. 30.....	40,650	46,221
Dec. 7.....	96,705	142,926
Dec. 14.....	194,957	337,883
Dec. 21.....	182,736	520,619
Dec. 28.....	74,307	594,926
Jan. 4.....	65,686	660,612
Jan. 11.....	78,819	739,431
Jan. 18.....	77,260	816,691
Jan. 25.....	88,990	905,681
Feb. 1.....	85,452	991,133

DISCHARGES OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS BY SPECIAL SERVICES THROUGH FEBRUARY 6.

Source of information: Commissioned Personnel Branch, Operations Division, General Staff.

	On duty Nov. 11.	Discharges week ended Feb. 6.	Discharges Nov. 11- Feb. 6.	Per cent discharged through Feb. 6.
Chemical Warfare.....	1,695	78	1,020	160
Military Aeronautics.....	18,661	576	8,924	48
Coast Artillery.....	4,580	126	2,031	44
Aircraft Production.....	1,898	98	762	40
Ordnance.....	5,925	287	1,935	33
Quartermaster.....	10,122	351	3,234	32
Medical.....	39,157	875	12,399	32
Signal.....	2,490	193	661	27
Engineer.....	10,302	247	2,530	25
Chaplains.....	2,229	40	447	20
Adjutant General.....	1,231	28	244	20
Judge Advocate General.....	418	8	80	19
Tank.....	1,237	5	230	19
Motor Transport.....	2,912	35	416	14
Inspector General.....	204	2	12	6
Infantry.....		1,406	21,161	
Field Artillery.....		595	8,885	
Cavalry.....		38	581	
Miscellaneous.....		113	846	
Total Infantry, etc.....	85,373	2,152	31,413	37
Grand total.....	188,434	5,101	66,333	35

¹Through Jan. 30.

DISCHARGES OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS SINCE NOVEMBER 11, BY WEEKS.

Source of information: Commissioned Personnel Branch, Operations Division, General Staff.

Discharges to February 7.

Week ended—	Weekly.	Cumulative.
Nov. 15.....	60	60
Nov. 22.....	103	163
Nov. 29.....	215	378
Dec. 6.....	7,280	7,658
Dec. 13.....	9,545	17,203
Dec. 20.....	9,700	26,903
Dec. 27.....	8,506	35,409
Jan. 3.....	5,082	40,491
Jan. 10.....	6,537	47,028
Jan. 17.....	5,395	52,423
Jan. 24.....	4,943	57,366
Jan. 31.....	4,535	61,901
Feb. 7.....	5,092	66,993

ARRIVAL OF TROOPS WHICH HAVE SAILED FROM OVERSEAS SINCE NOVEMBER 11, 1918.

Source of information: Embarkation Branch, Purchase, Storage and Traffic Division, General Staff.

Arrivals to February 7.

Week ended—	Weekly.	Cumulative.
Nov. 22.....	703	703
Nov. 29.....	1,195	1,898
Dec. 6.....	1,625	3,523
Dec. 13.....	13,438	16,961
Dec. 20.....	13,168	30,129
Dec. 27.....	32,603	62,732
Jan. 3.....	12,234	74,966
Jan. 10.....	33,235	108,201
Jan. 17.....	17,735	125,936
Jan. 24.....	23,343	149,279
Jan. 31.....	26,850	176,129
Feb. 7.....	39,620	215,749

OFFICERS.

Total number of officers resigned or discharged..... 71,235

ENLISTED MEN.

Discharges up to and including Feb. 1, 1919..... 992,992
Discharges for week ending Feb. 8, 1919..... 78,082
Early returns week ending Feb. 15, 1919..... 32,236

1,103,310

Total discharges, officers and enlisted men..... 1,174,545

Orders have been issued to date (Feb. 14, 1919) for the demobilization of approximately 1,501,000 men, as follows:

Troops in the United States..... 1,272,000
Overseas troops returned to the United States..... 229,000

Total ordered demobilized..... 1,501,000

Later returns will bring the returns for the week ending February 15, 1919, to at least the number discharged for the week ending February 8.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve it for the time being to allow the gentleman from Illinois to proceed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the figures given us by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] are very interesting. They are based on figures furnished by the War Department. I did not criticize in the remarks I made yesterday either the amount carried as an appropriation nor the legislative proposition for an Army of half a million men, but made an inquiry which, if anything, is more forceful under the figures submitted by the gentleman from Virginia than they were under figures furnished in the hearings. In the hearings the War Department estimated an Army of a million men on the 1st of July, 200,000 at the end of the fiscal year, and an average of 500,000 during the year, then asked an appropriation equivalent to pay an Army of 500,000 men for the year. Now the gentleman from Virginia has figures recently coming from the War Department estimating an Army of a million men at the beginning of the year, I did not understand how many at the end of the year, and an average of 335,000 a month during the year. So that there would be a much less Army during the year than the original figures submitted by the War Department. When I asked yesterday the question—and I repeat it now—if the Army is estimated on a million men at the beginning of the year and an average of 500,000 a month during the year, or at a million men at the beginning of the year and 335,000 a month average during the year, what is the necessity of authorizing an enlistment of 510,000 men for a year's time? [Applause.]

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. We start out with a million men.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. And we can not demobilize them all at once, but we demobilize at the rate of 300,000 a month; but we can not enlist all of the 500,000 at once, but we enlist at the rate of 25,000 a month.

Mr. MANN. Very well, suppose we enlist at the rate of 25,000 a month, you can not bring the average down to 500,000 a month, much less 335,000 a month, if we need authority to enlist half a million men. Anybody who can add two and two and make four, and not make five, can see that if you start with a million men and have an average for the year of 335,000 a month you do not need to authorize the additional enlistment of 500,000 for the year, and it does not take a mathematician to figure that out; a boy in almost the primer grade can figure that out. I do not say you ought not to authorize 500,000—that will come up later—but there is no occasion to do it unless you contemplate a deficit in the appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wanting to suggest to the gentleman, if it is not true that this average of 335,000, or whatever it may be, includes not only those who are in the Army who are going out but all those who are coming in, so you have to add both those figures in order to get the average?

Mr. MANN. Of course, an average is a conclusion. If we only have an average of 500,000, and much more stronger the reason an average of 335,000, for the year, starting with a million men and making a gradual reduction, you do not need authority to enlist 500,000 for a year to keep up that average.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. ANTHONY. With the knowledge that it is problematical the number of men we will be able to bring in and the probable number of men we will be able to enlist, does not the gentleman

realize it is almost impossible to bring to an actual mathematical certainty the number of men we will be able to maintain?

Mr. MANN. Well, it may be, but the trouble is the gentleman on the Committee of Military Affairs and the War Department have endeavored to bring it down to the point of mathematical certainty in order to convert the House, and I am showing the fallacy of their mathematics.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will permit, when we do get the average down to 300,000, what authority will there be in existing law to hold it above the 175,000 that are founded upon the national defense act, unless we have a legislative provision in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. I do that in order to take up another matter. I think the War Department has done great work, and I am not sure all the boys in France ought to be returned at once.

I am inclined to think we ought to maintain something of an Army in Europe until the German Army itself is demobilized and out of the way. How soon that will be done I do not know, but I hope it will be done speedily. But speaking of transportation, I have an illustration here of what seems to me to be, to say the least, a gross negligence or impropriety on the part of the War Department. Here is a letter written to me from Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, where a man was enlisted as a captain of Engineers at Honolulu October 4, 1917, and who was discharged on his own application by an order dated December 31, 1918. And with this statement, "Stations to which officers are entitled to travel pay." Answer, "Honolulu, H. I."

He applied for transportation on one of the Government transports, not receiving pay in cash for the transportation. He was awarded, with his wife, second-class transportation, which may have been all the Army could well have furnished at the time on the transport. He was obliged to sail, on account of his business, and accepted the second-class transportation. He writes to me:

My wife, with four other wives of officers and ex-officers, were assigned to one second-class cabin (four bunks and a settee), and I was one of five officers and ex-officers assigned to a similar cabin. Occupying first-class cabins were at least a dozen lieutenants, traveling under order, and a captain, Quartermaster Corps, on leave of absence, all without families. I suggested to the field clerk in charge at the San Francisco office that the five ladies in cabin No. 54 be given first-class cabins and that the lieutenants above mentioned be assigned to the second-class cabins, but no action was taken.

The cabin to which these ladies were assigned was on the "orlop" deck, which is so far down in the ship that the second-class steward in charge refused to open the portholes for fear of seas entering. There was also no bell service.

Special Orders, No. 264, Camp Kearny, covering my discharge, states that I am entitled to travel with pay to Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii. This was furnished only to San Francisco, and I was required to pay for my own subsistence (\$8) on the transport. (See copy of orders and receipt attached.)

My case is but typical of scores of others relative to men going into active service from Hawaii and the Philippines.

I know of one other case of five men who enlisted, or were drafted, in Hawaii, were ordered to the mainland, and were discharged at San Francisco on December 7, 1918 (two days after the transport had sailed). These men were left to live 30 days in San Francisco on what was left from their last month's pay after allotments, insurance, etc., had been deducted, and when they did get aboard the transport they were required to pay for their food en route to Honolulu. An appeal was made to headquarters, Western Department, but they were refused admittance to see the commanding general, and were directed to the charities department of the Red Cross for relief.

This man was required to pay in cash for his food on board the transport. Think of it, gentlemen. Men taken into the Army, either by volunteering or by draft, from Hawaii, given under the law the right to be transported to the place from which they came, discharged at San Francisco, and practically told to walk home or beg. With the great Government of the United States, which wants to treat its soldiers well—and the people do—with men in the War Department so calloused or so careless—it makes not any difference which—these men, first, are required to beg of the Red Cross charity that they may keep body and soul together while awaiting a transport to take them home, and then, as to these officers, their wives compelled to live down below or at the level of the water on the ocean, with quarters on the outside of the vessel, five people in a cabin, while some bright, nice, clean, young second lieutenant is occupying the cabin on the upper deck.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert this letter in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the letter in full:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, January 22, 1919.

HON. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I was called to active service as a captain of Engineers at Honolulu, Hawaii, on October 4, 1917, and after serving on staff duty at headquarters Hawaiian Department, United States Army, at Honolulu, was ordered to Camp Lec, Va., and served at several mainland posts, finally being discharged at Camp Kearny, Cal., on December 31, 1918.

On or about December 10, when I decided to ask for discharge from the Army, I wrote to the depot quartermaster, San Francisco, requesting transportation for my wife and self on the United States Army transport sailing for Honolulu on January 6, 1919, and was advised that, as I was not traveling under orders, I should apply to the director of transportation, Washington, D. C. This reply was received after I had reported at Camp Kearny. The matter of transportation for myself back to Honolulu was taken up with the post authorities, and I was advised that they could do nothing in the matter, and that I should take it up personally with the Quartermaster General. Accordingly I wired the Quartermaster General at my own expense and, in reply, was advised that reservation had been made for my wife and self in second-class quarters with first-class dining and deck privileges on the U. S. S. *Sherman*, sailing from San Francisco January 6, 1919.

On December 23, 1918, I wired the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C., inviting his attention to the fact that I had been called to the colors at Honolulu, etc., and requesting that I be ordered to Honolulu for discharge. This wire was not even answered. There was nothing in Army regulations or orders which would have prevented the action requested in my telegram being taken.

Inquiry at steamship office resulted in the reply that no first-class bookings on liners to Honolulu were available previous to about the middle of February, and, as my personal business affairs required my immediate return to Honolulu, my wife and self accepted the second-class quarters offered on the *Sherman*.

My wife, with four other wives of officers and ex-officers, were assigned to one second-class cabin (four bunks and a settee), and I was one of five officers and ex-officers assigned to a similar cabin.

Occupying first-class cabins were at least a dozen lieutenants traveling under orders and a captain, Quartermaster Corps, on leave of absence, all without families. I suggested to the field clerk in charge at the San Francisco office that the five ladies in cabin No. 54 be given first-class cabins and that the lieutenants above mentioned be assigned to the second-class cabins, but no action was taken.

The cabin to which these ladies was assigned was on the "orlop" deck, which is so far down in the ship that the second-class steward in charge refused to open the portholes for fear of seas entering. There was also no bell service.

Special Orders, No. 264, Camp Kearny, covering my discharge, states that I am entitled to travel with pay to Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii. This was furnished only to San Francisco, and I was required to pay for my own subsistence (\$8) on the transport. (See copy of orders and receipt attached.)

My case is but typical of scores of others relative to men going into active service from Hawaii and the Philippines. I know of one other case of five men who enlisted, or were drafted in Hawaii, were ordered to the mainland, and were discharged at San Francisco on December 7, 1918 (two days after the transport had sailed). These men were left to live 30 days in San Francisco on what was left from their last month's pay after allotments, insurance, etc., had been deducted, and when they did get aboard the transport they were required to pay for their food en route to Honolulu. An appeal was made to headquarters, Western Department, but they were refused admittance to see the commanding general, and were directed to the charities department of the Red Cross for relief. Should you so desire I can furnish you with the names of men who have suffered from this unjust treatment and the details in each case.

I am bringing the matter to your attention, as previous to my coming to Hawaii in 1912 I was a resident of Havana, Ill., and a University of Illinois man.

Very respectfully,

G. K. LARRISON,
Manoa and Cooper Rds.,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

HEADQUARTERS CAMP KEARNY,
California, December 31, 1918.

Special Orders, No. 264.

Extract.

2. By direction of the President, and under the provisions of section 9, act of Congress, May 18, 1917, and Circular No. 75, War Department, 1918, the following named officers, of organizations as indicated, are honorably discharged from the service of the United States, for the convenience of the Government, to take effect this date, their services being no longer required.

216th Engineers. Stations to which officers are entitled to travel pay.

Capt. Larrison, George Kirkpatrick, Engineers. Honolulu, H. T.

By command of Brig. Gen. Davison:

L. W. OLIVER,
Colonel, General Staff, Chief of Staff.

Official:

H. C. SMITH,
Major, A. G., Adjutant.

A true copy.

HOWARD S. REED,
Captain, Engineers, Adjutant.

Q. M. C. Form 927.

Approved January 23, 1919.

No. _____

U. S. ARMY TRANSPORT "SHERMAN,"

Jan. 14, 1919.

Received from G. K. Larrison, ex-capt. U. S. A., eight dollars — cents for meals from Jan. 6, D, to Jan. 14, B, 8 days, @ \$1.00 per day.

N. E. BURNS,
Quartermaster Agent.

San Francisco to Honolulu, H. T.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the following words: Page 32, line 5, the word "purchase," and in line 11 the words "purchase and."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the whole paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his reservation of the point of order against the paragraph, and the gentleman from Missouri renews it.

Mr. DYER. Unless the chairman desires to discuss it, I will make it.

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman make the point of order on the entire paragraph?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I would like to know what the ground for that is.

Mr. DYER. I make it on the ground that it is legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a minute?

Mr. DYER. For a minute; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is quite aware that this item provides for the transportation of our soldier boys from overseas home. It is the only item that provides for transportation from the camps and cantonments to their homes also. I do not believe the gentleman wishes to make a point of order to the very means for providing for the transportation of our soldiers.

Mr. DYER. I do not.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does the gentleman mean thereby to declare his intention to keep the men in Europe?

Mr. DYER. The gentleman's own party, the Democratic Party, and the administration are the ones that have charge of bringing the men home.

Mr. GORDON. They have not done it.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] would charge me with not wishing to have the boys returned. I have been trying to get the men home and doing my best; and it is because the Government is not doing its duty and has been lying to Congress and to the people that I am making this point of order, in order that we may find out if they really want to bring the men back.

In this paragraph, Mr. Chairman, provision is made for the purchase of other motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for transportation of troops and supplies. The Motor Transport Corps is now loaded up with vehicles of this kind, and they are rotting in the rain, in the weather, and they have more than they need; and to appropriate more money for the purchase of motor vehicles, to be wasted and to lie out in waste, is only for one purpose, as I can see it. The Motor Transport Corps, now inefficient and incompetent, as it is in various camps of this country, are doing nothing with reference to these vehicles except to give officers commissions to stay there, and to make the enlisted men do laboring work of the commonest sort, and I do not propose to support an item for the purchase of any more motor vehicles unless I know that they are needed. I am willing that the paragraph shall be amended so as to furnish transportation money to bring the soldiers home from France and bring those home that are in this country, but not for everything that is in this section.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that he seems to have missed the point that my point of order was the elimination of authority to the department to purchase automobiles of any character at all. That point of order has been sustained, so that the objection that the gentleman raises to this item has been cured by the point of order. On page 32, line 5, the word "purchase" has been stricken out, so that it now only provides for operation and maintenance. On line 11, as to the purchase of ships, I made that point of order with the approval of several members on the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DYER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. If this section is adopted as now written, with the point of order made by the gentleman sustained, will there be any authority in the War Department to purchase any more motor vehicles for the use of the Transport Corps anywhere else?

Mr. STAFFORD. No.

Mr. RUCKER. It does not prevent hiring. Can they not go ahead and hire them?

Mr. STAFFORD. There might be a necessity in some cases to hire conveyances to transport our boys to the railroad stations. There might be such an exigency.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not want them to be compelled to walk there. The gentleman's logic might go to the word "hire" also. There might be some cases where the Army has not purchased these vehicles.

Mr. STAFFORD. They can be transshipped to those places where they are needed.

Mr. RUCKER. I think if the word "purchase" is not left in there the word "hire" ought to be left in.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think the point that the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Wisconsin makes is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not give the gentleman indefinite range.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I ask unanimous consent for recognition in my own right.

Mr. DYER. I have the floor. I would like to retain it for two minutes, so that the gentleman may ask me a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The report made to the committee shows that the War Department has on hand now \$214,000,000 worth of these motor-propelled vehicles, so that the point is well taken that we do not need to authorize them to purchase any more of them. In the hearings, where they asked \$18,000,000 of the \$449,000,000 to be used for that department, the statement shows that it is for the repair of those things that go to the operation of the machine. There is nothing in the report that shows that they need any more automobiles or that they intended to purchase any more.

Mr. DYER. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska, whose judgment I value very highly, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, page 32, line 19, by striking out "\$449,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$411,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] withdraws his reservation of a point of order, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Line 19, page 32, strike out "\$449,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$411,000,000."

Mr. DENT. I accept that amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Alabama accepts the amendment. The purpose of it is to reduce the estimate of the amount provided for the purchase of ships and tugs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: Page 32, line 19, at the end of the paragraph, insert:

"Provided further, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for the purchase, maintenance, or operation of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle in the District of Columbia."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent the expenditure of Government money to buy and maintain automobiles for the use of officials of the War Department. There are from 260 to 275 passenger automobiles being used by Army officers at the expense of the Government in the District of Columbia.

I see no reason why the officials of the War Department should have automobiles furnished them any more than that officials of any other department of the Government in Washington should have such luxuries furnished them. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the gentleman's amendment eliminate the maintenance and operation of the automobile of the Secretary of War?

Mr. FLOOD. It would not; no. That automobile is specifically appropriated for in the legislative appropriation bill, as

are the automobiles for the use of other members of the Cabinet. That is right, because Congress has considered that matter and determined upon the wisdom of the appropriation for that purpose. But here are a great number of automobiles assigned by Army officers to themselves and for their own use and paid for from a lump-sum appropriation made in this bill. There is no authority in law for such a use of these funds; it is a perversion of the appropriation and is an abuse that should be stopped. This amendment will stop that abuse.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Would not the gentleman's amendment apply as well, if so worded, to other cities as well as Washington? I have information that I can give the gentleman as to their use in exactly the same way in other cities as the motor-propelled vehicle service is used here in this city. Why specify Washington solely?

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman is right. We ought to prohibit their use in other places as well as in Washington; but I had not accurate information except as to the District of Columbia, where there are 275 high-class automobiles, paid for by this Government, costing the Government probably \$2,500 a year apiece for maintenance, or \$600,000 or \$700,000 a year, and used by Army officers for their individual use, or to carry other Army officers from their places of residence to their places of business and back, and for other purpose of convenience and comfort to these officers.

This is done in other places, such as New York and Philadelphia, and I will be glad to enlarge the amendment so it will embrace other places as well as Washington.

Mr. SNOOK. When I go to the State, War, and Navy Building, I have noticed that they have a large number of automobiles standing out there, and that they run a regular hack service for the officers.

Mr. FLOOD. I understand that is done.

Mr. SNOOK. Is that included in this?

Mr. FLOOD. That is included in this, and as far as my information goes, this amendment will eliminate every passenger automobile now used by Army officers for their individual use or for their community use in the District of Columbia; and, with the enlargement of the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, in the country.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Not only are these automobiles used by Army officials, but are they not driven by private soldiers who do nothing else except wait on these Army officers, and who ought to be discharged so that they may get back into some legitimate line of business?

Mr. FLOOD. As the gentleman says, each one of these 275 automobiles is driven by a private soldier, rendering menial service to some officer who may be in many respects inferior to the private who is driving for him. It is an outrage to impose menial service on men who volunteered or were drafted in the Army of the United States to fight the battles of this Nation. [Applause.]

I voted to send our boys to war to fight, to suffer hardships, to make sacrifices, to risk their limbs and their lives, and, if need be, to die for their country and the cause of liberty. I cast my vote gladly, willingly, because I knew my country was right and needed soldiers to defend her rights and her honor, but I did not vote to place the brave, patriotic, upstanding boys of this country in the ranks of the Army to act as servants for any man, and I protest against the use of soldiers for such purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. If this amendment is agreed to it will also relieve the congestion by furnishing considerable parking space around the State, War, and Navy Building for other automobiles of people who have business there.

Mr. FLOOD. And it will give considerable space in the streets of Washington for people to travel in safety who pay for their own automobiles. [Applause.]

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Is the gentleman aware that some seven or eight garages are being maintained for the care and repair of these Army officers' automobiles?

Mr. FLOOD. About eight of them, I believe.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman's amendment eliminate those?

Mr. FLOOD. It will eliminate the necessity for some of them. This amendment applies only to passenger automobiles. It does not apply to truck automobiles.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman accept an amendment to his amendment, applying it to passenger automobiles of Army officers anywhere in the United States?

Mr. FLOOD. I will be glad to accept such an amendment.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I observe that the gentleman's amendment applies to all motor-propelled vehicles used in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FLOOD. Passenger vehicles.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Passenger vehicles. The gentleman is aware that many privates as well as officers are hauled back and forth to maneuvers, and necessarily by the transport service, and would not the gentleman be willing to have this amendment limited to the commissioned officers and not apply to the private soldiers?

Mr. KNUTSON. We do not need any maneuvers now.

Mr. FLOOD. This abuse has grown up. There is no authority in law for the assigning of 275 automobiles for the use of officers here.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. It has grown up as an abuse by these Army officers.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman ought to confine his amendment to the officers.

Mr. FLOOD. I will accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman accept an amendment to his amendment by adding after the words "District of Columbia" the words "or elsewhere"?

Mr. FLOOD. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman's amendment cover the \$250 a day that we are spending for gasoline on these automobiles?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, certainly it does.

Mr. BUTLER. Can we not cut them out for the next four months as well as for the next fiscal year? We ought to stop them from using these automobiles now.

Mr. FLOOD. That would make the amendment subject to a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this amendment to the committee. It is in the interest of economy. The time has certainly come when we should economize. We appropriated money and it was spent with a liberal and maybe a reckless hand when we were in war and no one objected, and no one will now honestly criticize such expenditures, because they were often made when men had to act so quickly they did not have time to think. But the time has come when we have time to think and to consider every item, when we owe it to the country to retrench wherever possible and certainly to cut out every unnecessary and wasteful expenditure. This amendment will save \$2,000,000 a year that is being spent for no useful purpose and without authority of law. [Applause.]

To adopt this amendment we would at least relieve 275 soldiers of work that they should not be doing and enable them to return to their homes, and it might hasten the War Department in demobilizing the thousands and thousands of other soldiers that should be released from the Army without delay. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS. I ask the gentleman if he will restate the main points of his amendment?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. SUMNERS. I want the gentleman from Virginia to restate the substance of his amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. The amendment prohibits the use of any funds in this bill for the purchase or maintenance of passenger-carrying automobiles for the use of the Army in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

Mr. KNUTSON. Or elsewhere?

Mr. FLOOD. Or elsewhere. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted. It is in the interest of economy; it is in the interest of decent and orderly government, and it is in the interest of our Military Establishment itself, because this unauthorized and unjustifiable use of a lump-sum appropriation is one of the things that has cost many of our Army officers the confidence and affection of people, who would like to feel differently to all who wear the uniform of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close at 1 o'clock.

Mr. TREADWAY. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. KINCHELOE. Reserving the right to object, I have no disposition to discuss it; but I want to offer an amendment by adding after the District of Columbia the words "or elsewhere in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto terminate at 1 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, two gentlemen over here on this side want five minutes each.

Mr. DENT. I will make it five minutes after 1 o'clock.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will not the gentleman make it 10 minutes after?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. How is the time to be distributed?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] wants five minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] wants five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I want three minutes.

Mr. DENT. And the gentleman from Nebraska five minutes and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto shall close at the expiration of 19 minutes, the time to be divided as stated. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close at 10 minutes past 1 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close at 10 minutes past 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the different gentlemen included in the proposition for unanimous consent. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] cutting out the special privilege to Army officers using automobiles almost indiscriminately in the city of Washington at Government expense. The same practice is evidently carried on in other cities. I have made a slight estimate of the daily maintenance of the cost of these cars here in Washington alone, which I think is ample evidence that we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

As stated a day or two ago, I have a letter, dated February 8, from Brig. Gen. Drake, chief of motor transportation, in which he informs me that there are 260 passenger automobiles assigned to the District, 152 in operation in the general service in this city, and the daily consumption of gasoline for all passenger automobiles enumerated above is 1,068 gallons per day. There are similar cars in operation in New York City to the number of 120 and in Philadelphia 40.

It is therefore safe to assume that there can not be less than 600 or 700 passenger automobiles operated throughout the country for the pleasure and convenience of a few Army officers.

Now, here is the daily expenses in the District. Allowing gasoline to be sold at 25 cents to the Government, which is less than the individual can buy it, the gasoline consumed here daily would be over \$250. There is a chauffeur with each one of these cars who is a private and receives \$1 a day and upkeep, so that these chauffeurs would be an expense of at least \$500.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I want to ask the gentleman if, in view of the fact that the appropriation does not start until June 30 of this year, he does not think that there should be an amendment covering the period between now and July?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think the abuse should be canceled now; but that is another matter, as the machines are now being oper-

ated under a previous appropriation. Let us fix it so that they can not be run after July 1. We are powerless up to that date and will have to accept it. There must be a large element of wear and tear. A conservative estimate for tires and other expenses would be \$250 more.

Mr. FLOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. It is estimated that each soldier in the Army costs the Government \$1,400 or \$1,500 a year. These automobiles take all the time of a private soldier, so that the automobile is costing the Government for each chauffeur \$1,400 or \$1,500.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is true, but I was not putting that in; I was only putting in the payment in wages and the sustenance, trying to be conservative. There is no question, gentlemen, but that the cost would run much higher than the figures I am giving. The wear and tear of the cars can not be less than \$250, making a total of \$1,000 a day the Government is paying for allowing these officers to go around the city in Government-owned automobiles. These are the circumstances, and it is indicative of the reason for the gentleman's amendment. Such extravagances as these account to some extent for the large tax bills we are asked to pay. Unless action is taken to check this and similar extravagances taxes will continue to soar skyward.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, at the end of the paragraph, as an amendment to the amendment, add "and elsewhere in the United States, except those used for the transportation of enlisted men of the Army when upon military duty."

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I now ask that the Clerk read the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia as it would read if amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 19, at the end of the paragraph, after line 19, insert: "Provided, further, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for the purchase, maintenance, or operation of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States, except those used for the transportation of the enlisted men of the Army when upon military duty."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is it not necessary to except those that may be used on reservations in the United States, and should not the language be "transportation of enlisted men of the Army for military purposes"? It might not be military duty to transport men from the station to a camp, but it would certainly be for a military purpose.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to so modify my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment by striking out the words "of the Army when upon military duty," and inserting the words "for military purposes," so that as amended the amendment will read:

"Provided further, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for the purchase, maintenance, or operation of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States, except those used for the transportation of the enlisted men for military purposes."

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. This is in the time of the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. RUCKER. Would it not also be wise to insert the words "or hire" after the word "purchase"? I offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], who has given this matter attention and who has offered this amendment, informs me that he will accept my amendment to it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the provision seems to allow enlisted men to ride and not officers, would it not be a good idea to allow the officers to have roller skates, so that they could hang on behind? They have got to

go around Washington to the various places where the War Department is situated.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think if we carry on this matter of allowing officers of the Army to have vehicles we will soon have a legless Army, and I am in favor of developing their legs as well as the legs of the men.

Mr. SANFORD. Roller skates would develop their legs.

Mr. SNELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURNETT. Would the fixing of the time for debate include the offering of amendments to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; because gentlemen must get the floor in order to offer an amendment.

Mr. BURNETT. That can be done when the time expires, can it not?

The CHAIRMAN. There would be no difficulty in so arranging for that, but not under the order.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, there was no agreement of the House by which certain gentlemen were to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. No; there was not. There was a unanimous-consent agreement which was defeated by the objection of the gentleman, and then the motion was put and agreed to and the Chair stated at that time that he would recognize those gentlemen who had been named in the unanimous-consent agreement, and the Chair will do that. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion here about the trucks and automobiles now being used in the Army, the new ones on hand, the number yet to come on unfilled orders, and the future disposition of the same. I have been making some investigation along this line and believe this information should be given to the House and to the country. I want the country to know the enormous number of motor vehicles we own and have on hand, both used and new, at the present time, as well as the large and almost unbelievable number yet to be delivered on unfilled orders. I call your attention to this at this time because I believe Congress should force the War Department to adopt some policy immediately in regard to the disposition of these motor cars, that are not needed and prob-

ably never will be needed by the War Department. A great many people are asking whether they are for sale or not. I am informed that to some inquiries the department has said they were not for sale, to others they were not for sale at present, and still another Member has just told me he believes that in some cases they are selling them. The armistice was signed nearly four months ago, and I maintain some one, somewhere should know by this time what we are going to do with the billions of dollars' worth of valuable material we have on hand that is no longer used for Government purposes.

On February 5 the Assistant Director of Purchase and Storage informed me that there were approximately 51,000 motor trucks; 8,500 ambulances, and 8,600 passenger cars in the hands of the American Expeditionary Forces.

The number of new or used cars in this country, both truck and passenger, I was unable to get, as they did not have the information in the department at that time; but every man knows there are countless numbers of them in every part of the country, and most of them are just burning gas and using up tires and not producing anything at the present time.

At the time of the signing of the armistice there were on orders and still undelivered to the Government 138,424 autos and trucks; 96,952 of this amount were canceled, and the balance, or 41,472, were to be delivered at a future date.

On January 9, 1919, two months after the signing of the armistice—and this is the last tabulation made up to the present time—there were still to be delivered to the Government autos, trucks, and motorcycles as follows:

9 C. M. 1-ton ambulances.....	1,834
8 C. M. Standard 1-ton trucks.....	4,921
1½-ton Standard trucks.....	3,090
Standard 3, 4, and 5 ton trucks.....	9,068
Special 2 and 3 ton trucks.....	7,782
Limousines.....	15
Motorcycles.....	9,408
Standard 1½-ton trucks for domestic use.....	563
Standard 3-ton and heavier trucks for domestic use.....	1,371

Below is given a complete list of orders at the time of signing of the armistice, the number canceled, and number to be delivered by each contractor and the expected date of delivery, although I have been advised by the department that the time of some of these deliveries has been further extended:

Status and estimated production of total motor vehicle orders—showing contract terminations since the signing of the armistice.

VEHICLES STANDARDIZED FOR OVERSEAS SHIPMENT.

[Motors and Vehicles Division, Office of the Director of Purchases.]

Name.	Class.	Capacity.	Manufacturer.	Address.	Total ordered to Dec. 31.	Total completed to Dec. 31.	Canceled.	Balance due.	Produced Dec. 11-31.	Prospective deliveries.			
										January.	February.	March.	April.
G. M. C. standard.....	Amb.....	1-ton.....	Dort Motor Co.....	Flint, Mich.....	1,000	226		774	142	174	200	200	200
Do.....	Amb.....	do.....	General Motor Truck Co.....	Pontiac, Mich.....	6,811	6,093		718	182	368	350		
Ford ambulance.....	Amb.....	do.....	Ford Motor Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	10,042	5,722	3,928	392	62	392			
Total.....					17,853	12,041	3,928	1,884	396	934	550	200	200
G. M. C. standard.....	AA.....	1-ton.....	Commerce Motor Car Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	450			450		60	100	150	140
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Vellie Motors Corporation.....	Moline, Ill.....	1,000			1,000		200	300	300	200
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Elgin Motor Car Corporation.....	Elgin, Ill.....	500			500		100	150	150	100
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Lexington Motor Co.....	Connersville, Ind.....	500			500		120	130	150	100
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Auburn Auto Co.....	Auburn, Ind.....	500			500		90	110	150	150
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Hupp Motor Car Corporation.....	Detroit, Mich.....	500			500		120	130	150	100
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Saxon Motor Car Co.....	do.....	500	8		492	8	92	125	150	125
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Columbia Motor Co.....	do.....	300	71		229	71	89	100	40	
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Moon Motor Car Co.....	St. Louis, Mo.....	300			300		50	75	100	75
Do.....	AA.....	do.....	Liberty Motor Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	450			450		90	110	150	100
White.....	AA.....	do.....	The White Co.....	Cleveland, Ohio.....	2,695	2,695			236				
Total.....					7,695	2,774		4,921	315	1,011	1,330	1,490	1,090
Dodge light delivery.....	Lt. Del.....	½-ton.....	Dodge Bros. Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	9,353	3,454	5,899						
Vodge light repair.....	Lt. Del.....	½-ton.....	Dodge Bros. Co. (discontinued).	do.....	1,012	1,012							
Ford light delivery.....	Lt. Del.....	do.....	Ford Motor Co.....	do.....	12,002	6,248	5,754						
Total.....					22,367	10,714	11,653						
White standard.....	A.....	1½-ton.....	The White Co.....	Cleveland, Ohio.....	9,202	2,412	5,000	1,790	74	490	500	500	300
Do.....	A.....	do.....	Peerless Motor Co.....	do.....	3,000		3,000						
Total.....					12,202	2,412	8,000	1,790	74	490	500	500	300
Light aviation.....	A.....	1½-ton.....	General Motor Truck Co.....	Pontiac, Mich.....	2,400	2,400			93				
Do.....	A.....	do.....	Paige Motor Car Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	500	500							
Do.....	A.....	do.....	Republic Motor Truck Co.....	Alma, Mich.....	500	486		14	11	14			
Do.....	A.....	do.....	Denby Motor Truck Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	500	500							
Garford.....	A.....	do.....	Garford Motor Truck Co.....	Lima, Ohio.....	5,010	1,307	3,000	703	180	300	300	103	
Packard.....	A.....	do.....	Packard Motor Car Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	406								
Pierce-Arrow.....	A.....	do.....	Pierce-Arrow Motor Car Co.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	4,023	2,540	900	583	17	183	200	200	
Total.....					13,339	8,139	3,900	1,300	301	497	500	303	

* A number of trucks on each of these orders have been completed, but as none of them have been inspected and accepted they can not properly be shown on this report.

Status and estimated production of total motor vehicle orders—showing contract terminations since the signing of the armistice—Continued.

VEHICLES STANDARDIZED FOR OVERSEAS SHIPMENT—continued.

Name.	Class.	Capacity.	Manufacturer.	Address.	Total ordered to Dec. 31.	Total completed to Dec. 31.	Canceled.	Balance due.	Produced Dec. 11-31.	Prospective deliveries.			
										January.	February.	March.	April.
Standardized "B" ..	B.....	3-ton.....	Packard Motor Car Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	5	5							
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Gramm-Bernstein Motor Truck Co.....	Lima, Ohio.....	3,750	1,033	2,000	717		242	175	150	150
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co.....	Springfield, Ohio.....	1,045	500		545		135	140	140	130
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Indiana Truck Corporation.....	Marion, Ind.....	2,545	544	1,500	501	29	116	130	140	115
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Service Motor Truck Co.....	Wabash, Ind.....	1,795	623	750	422	114	140	145	137	
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Republic Motor Truck Co.....	Alma, Mich.....	3,750	1,344	2,000	406	237	206	200		
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Selden Truck Sales Co.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	3,750	1,266	2,000	484	193	174	180	130	
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Pierce-Arrow Motor Car Co.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	1,000	1,000							
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Bethlehem Motors Corporation.....	Allentown, Pa.....	2,725	850	1,500	375	100	125	125	125	
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Diamond T Motor Co.....	Chicago, Ill.....	3,203	783	2,000	420	111	125	150	145	
Do.....	B.....	do.....	U. S. Motor Truck Co.....	Cincinnati, Ohio.....	2,545	629	1,500	416	88	176	150	90	
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Brockway Motor Truck Co.....	Cortland, N. Y.....	2,202	670	1,000	532	20	182	125	125	100
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Vellie Motors Corporation.....	Moline, Ill.....	3,045	658	2,000	387	149	162	150	75	
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Sterling Motor Truck Corporation.....	Milwaukee, Wis.....	1,795	527	750	518	27	150	125	125	118
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Garford Motor Truck Co.....	Lima, Ohio.....	1,750	1,000		750		225	200	200	125
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Hurlburt Motor Truck Co.....	New York, N. Y.....	100			100		25	25	25	25
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Midland Motor Truck Co.....	Oklahoma City, Okla.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Atterbury Motor Car Co.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	750		750						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Standard Motor Truck Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	750		750						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Maccar Co.....	Scranton, Pa.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Clyde Cars Co.....	Clyde, Ohio.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Rowe Motor Manufacturing Co.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	J. C. Wilson Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Lewis Hall Iron Works.....	do.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Denby Motor Truck Co.....	do.....	1,500		1,500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Winthrop Motor Truck Co.....	Winthrop Harbor, Ill.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Vim Motor Truck Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Signal Motor Truck Co.....	do.....	500		500						
Do.....	B.....	do.....	United Motors Co.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.....	500		500						
Total.....					43,005	11,432	25,000	6,573	1,068	2,183	2,020	1,607	763
Packard.....	B.....	3-ton.....	Packard Motor Car Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	10,934	5,910	3,750	1,274	52	374	300	300	300
Heavy aviation.....	B.....	do.....	United Motors Co.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.....	200	200							
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Federal Motor Truck Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	1,000	1,000							
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co.....	Springfield, Ohio.....	2,225	2,098		127	224	127			
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Standard Motor Truck Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	250	250			12				
Do.....	B.....	do.....	Vellie Motors Corporation.....	Moline, Ill.....	1,000	948		52	75	52			
Riker.....	B.....	4-ton.....	Locomobile Co. of America.....	Bridgeport, Conn.....	3,690	1,848	1,500	342	73	175	167		
Pierce-Arrow.....	B.....	5-ton.....	Pierce-Arrow Motor Car Co.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	3,170	2,304	600	266	74	166	100		
Mack.....	B.....	5½-ton.....	International Motors Co.....	New York, N. Y.....	5,575	3,141	2,000	434	288	210	224		
Total.....					28,044	17,699	7,850	2,495	798	1,104	791	300	300
Four-wheel drive.....	TT.....	2-ton.....	Nash Motors Co.....	Kenosha, Wis.....	14,684	9,774	4,000	910	581	700	210		
Do.....	TT.....	do.....	Hudson Motor Car Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	3,000	500	2,500		44				
Do.....	TT.....	do.....	National Motor Car & Vehicle Co.....	Indianapolis, Ind.....	3,000	473	1,000	1,527	126	300	350	377	500
Do.....	TT.....	do.....	Paige Motor Car Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	3,000	568	1,500	932	109	400	400	132	
Do.....	TT.....	3-ton.....	Four-Wheel Drive Auto Co.....	Clintonville, Wis.....	7,150	4,913	1,000	1,237	40	475	475	287	
Do.....	TT.....	do.....	Mitchell Motors Corporation.....	Racine, Wis.....	5,023	1,598	2,000	1,425	237	400	400	400	225
Do.....	TT.....	do.....	Premier Motor Co.....	Indianapolis, Ind.....	4,500	1,821	2,000	679	179	350	329		
Do.....	TT.....	do.....	Kissel Motor Car Co.....	Hartford, Wis.....	3,500	1,245	1,500	755	92	300	300	155	
Total.....					43,857	20,892	15,500	7,465	1,408	2,925	2,464	1,351	725
Four-wheel drive.....	Winch.....	2-ton.....	Nash Motors Co.....	Kenosha, Wis.....	100	100							
Do.....	Winch.....	3-ton.....	Four-Wheel Drive Auto Co.....	Clintonville, Wis.....	800	483		317	100	100	100	100	17
Total.....					900	583		317	100	100	100	100	17
Cadillac limousine.....	Pass.....		Cadillac Motor Car Co.....	Detroit, Mich.....	1,055	338	705	12	17	12			
Cadillac open.....	Pass.....		do.....	do.....	2,970	1,962	1,008						
Dodge open.....	Pass.....		Dodge Bros. Co.....	do.....	8,559	5,678	2,881						
Dodge winter top.....	Pass.....		do.....	do.....	3,201	2,404	797						
Ford touring.....	Pass.....		Ford Motor Co.....	do.....	20,201	6,577	13,624						
Locomobile limousine.....	Pass.....		Locomobile Co. of America.....	Bridgeport, Conn.....	10	7		3	5	2	1		
Total.....					35,996	16,966	19,015	15	22	14	1		
Cleveland.....	Motorcycles.....		Cleveland Motors Manufacturing Co.....	Cleveland, Ohio.....	1,526	1,476		50	141	50			
Harley-Davidson.....	do.....		Harley-Davidson Motorcycle Co.....	Milwaukee, Wis.....	26,487	14,663	10,500	1,321	569	900	421		
Indian.....	do.....		Hendee Manufacturing Co.....	Springfield, Mass.....	39,870	18,018	19,200	2,652	997	1,500	1,152		
Total.....					67,883	34,163	29,700	4,023	1,707	2,450	1,573		
Harley-Davidson.....	Side cars.....		Harley-Davidson Motorcycle Co.....	Milwaukee, Wis.....	26,093	14,332	10,500	1,267	593	900	367		
Indian.....	do.....		Hendee Manufacturing Co.....	Springfield, Mass.....	33,124	16,804	19,200	3,120	995	1,630	1,500		
Total.....					65,223	31,136	29,700	4,387	1,588	2,520	1,867		
Military standard.....	Bicycles.....		Westfield Manufacturing Co.....	Westfield, Mass.....	36,002	22,502	13,500		704				
Do.....	do.....		Great Western Manufacturing Co.....	Laporte, Ind.....	15,750	3,750	12,000		161				
Do.....	do.....		Davis Sewing Machine Co.....	Dayton, Ohio.....	16,250	3,252	12,000	998		993			
Total.....					68,002	29,504	37,500	993	865	993			

Status and estimated production of total motor vehicle orders—showing contract terminations since the signing of the armistice—Continued.

VEHICLES STANDARDIZED FOR OVERSEAS SHIPMENT—continued.

Name.	Class.	Capacity.	Manufacturer.	Address.	Total ordered to Dec. 31.	Total completed to Dec. 31.	Canceled.	Balance due.	Produced Dec. 11-31.	Prospective deliveries.			
										January.	February.	March.	April.
Misc. Amer. and foreign.	AA.	2-1 ton.	Overseas inventory.		532	532							
Misc. foreign.	A.	1-2 ton.	Overseas purchase.		605	605							
Misc. foreign amb.	A.	do.	do.		192	192							
Misc. foreign.	B.	3-5 ton.	do.		1,603	1,603							
Do.	Pass.	do.	do.		507	507							
Misc. American.	Bicycles		Various dealers.		900	900							
Total.					4,339	4,339							

VEHICLES FOR DOMESTIC DISTRIBUTION.

Commerce.	AA.	1-ton.	Commerce Motor Car Co.	Detroit, Mich.	1,548	1,548							
Ford trucks.	AA.	1-1 ton.	Ford Motor Co.	do.	2,494	2,474	20						
Total.					4,042	4,022	20						
White, unstandardized.	A.	1-1 ton.	The White Co.	Cleveland, Ohio.	394	394							
Kelly-Springfield.	A.	do.	Kelly-Springfield Motor Co.	Springfield, Ohio.	356	16	170	170		35	70	65	
Denby.	A.	do.	Denby Motor Truck Co.	Detroit, Mich.	500	182	150	168	160	100	68		
International.	A.	do.	International Harvester Co.	Akron, Ohio.	1,125	485	500	140	102	140			
Misc. American.	A.	1-2 ton.	J. C. Wilson Co.	Detroit, Mich.	949	949							
Wilson.	A.	do.	do.	do.	200	75	50	75	27	50	25		
Moreland.	A.	do.	Moreland Motor Truck Co.	Los Angeles, Cal.	86	76		10	10	10			
Misc. Amer. Amb.	A.	do.	do.	do.	57	57							
Total.					3,667	2,234	870	563	299	335	163	65	
White.	B.	3-ton.	The White Co.	Cleveland, Ohio.	306	306							
Peerless.	B.	do.	Peerless Motor Car Co.	do.	885	697		188	104	125	63		
Kelly-Springfield.	B.	3-1 ton.	Kelly-Springfield Motor Co.	Springfield, Ohio.	920	21	460	439	21	89	125	125	100
Mack.	B.	do.	International Motors Co.	New York, N. Y.	262	262							
Vellie.	B.	do.	Vellie Motors Corp.	Moline, Ill.	137	28	100	9	16	9			
Gramm-Bernstein.	B.	do.	Gramm-Bernstein Motor Truck Co.	Lima, Ohio.	116	66	50		25				
Federal.	B.	do.	Federal Motor Truck Co.	Detroit, Mich.	500	85	250	165	66	120	45		
Standard.	B.	do.	Standard Motor Truck Co.	do.	387	89	75	223	2	63	80	80	
Selden.	B.	do.	Selden Motor Truck Co.	Rochester, N. Y.	171	121	50		41				
Republic.	B.	do.	Republic Motor Truck Co.	Alma, Mich.	250		125	125		100	25		
Moreland.	B.	4-ton.	Moreland Motor Truck Co.	Los Angeles, Cal.	60	40		20	20	20			
White.	B.	5-ton.	The White Co.	Cleveland, Ohio.	48	48							
Packard.	B.	do.	Packard Motor Car Co.	Detroit, Mich.	65	60		5		5			
Hurlburt.	B.	do.	Hurlburt Motor Truck Co.	New York, N. Y.	200		100	100		50	50		
Federal.	B.	do.	Federal Motor Truck Co.	Detroit, Mich.	300	53	150	97	38	97			
Misc. American.	B.	3-5 ton.	do.	do.	250	250							
Total.					4,857	2,126	1,360	1,371	333	678	388	205	100
Dodge Sedan.	Pass.		Dodge Bros. Co.	Detroit, Mich.	10		10						
Dodge Roadster.	Pass.		do.	do.	550	175	375						
Ford Roadster.	Pass.		Ford Motor Co.	do.	435	186	249						
Ford closed.	Pass.		do.	do.	16	16							
Misc. American.	Pass.		do.	do.	958	958							
Total.					1,969	1,335	634						

I regret I am unable to give accurately the number of new cars already delivered to the department and are now being stored in various places, and I am informed that by far the greater number are standing outdoors and exposed to the wind and weather during these winter months. However, I can give the actual number so stored in the vicinity of Baltimore at Camp Holabird:

Motor cars.	804
Trucks.	2,874
Mortorcycles.	1,014
Side cars.	873
Bicycles.	8
Trailers.	90
Auto bodies.	1,810

I am told the War Department intend taking these cars apart, boxing them up, and erecting buildings to store them in, and that it costs at least \$100 per car to take them apart, to say nothing of the cost of land and buildings to store them in.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to know and what the country wants to know is, if we have no need for these cars, what earthly excuse is there for us to continue making these cars in every part of the country, driving them at a large expense to Baltimore, then hiring men to take them apart and store them and put them away to be forgotten and actually lost, as far as any real value is concerned?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. WISE. Under this amendment as adopted, which provides that no gasoline shall be furnished or used through the funds of this appropriation for the use of these machines in Washington or elsewhere, Gen. Pershing in France would have to buy his own gasoline.

Mr. SNELL. I was not speaking of that amendment. I am simply calling attention of the Members to the number of trucks now on hand and the number yet to be delivered, in order to see if we can not get some information from the department as to what is to become of the trucks and what is going to be their future policy in regard to them.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Are any of them being sold?

Mr. SNELL. I can not find out definitely that there are any being sold or that they are going to sell any of them. It is privately whispered about that there was an arrangement between the automobile manufacturers of the country and the War Department that none of these trucks or machines that are now abroad would ever be sold over there or ever come back from France, but would be scrapped, and that none of these that the Government has on hand at the present time would ever be sold to the consuming public. That is what I want to find out, and I want the people of this country to know the enormous number of trucks that we have on hand and are yet to be delivered, and then see if public sentiment or Congress or something will not force the department to take some definite action to get our money out of this property that is slowly and surely going to waste at the present time. We can never get as much money out of these cars as at the present. The market has been short of small trucks and still is, and if the Government would go at it in a businesslike way I have no doubt but what a large number of these cars could be turned into money at once with little or no loss. Even if they sell them at some loss it would be better than to pile them up in an open lot to rust and decay.

Mr. SNOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. SNOOK. I will state to the gentleman that I had an inquiry from a gentleman from my district who wanted to buy one of these, and he addressed a letter to the War Department, and they informed him that they had none to sell and were not going to sell any, and all they had to spare they were going to turn over to the Post Office Department.

Mr. SNELL. That is the subject I was coming to in a few minutes, and I am glad the gentleman brought it up. It has been whispered about also that all of these trucks would be used in connection with the Post Office Department at a certain time.

If the Post Office Department has any use for any of them, let them have them at once, but as far as using these trucks for general parcel-post delivery throughout the country, there is nothing to it, for our post roads are not in condition to use them. One trip with a 3-ton truck over our average country roads after a rain delivering parcel post would put an end to it.

Now, the only sensible thing to do is not to buy land and buildings to store more trucks, but to stop buying immediately. Adopt some definite business policy and sell the trucks and cars we do not need to the consuming public. I do not mean to glut the market and disrupt business in this line, but distribute in such a way and in different sections, so as to not materially affect general conditions, but give the public an opportunity to buy these cars at the market value or enough less so the Government can clean up on them with as little loss as possible.

I think the time has come when we should take some definite action here if we have any control over what is going to be done with all this enormous amount of property. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, when I asked for the minute I did not desire to speak long about this at all, but the purpose of my asking for it was to offer the amendment which the gentleman from Nebraska and I have agreed upon, except I notice in his amendment there he does not use the language, "other parts of the United States." I think that ought to go in there, because I do not think that officers in Europe ought to be deprived of the use of these automobiles, and if the gentleman will agree to it I will ask unanimous consent that the words "United States" be inserted in his amendment.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I accept the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it shall read, "elsewhere in the United States."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I understood that that was it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that his amendment should be modified as indicated by the gentleman from Kentucky. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what it is.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. "Or elsewhere in the United States." In drawing the amendment I left out those words. I wrote it twice, but gentlemen came up and I wrote it very hurriedly. However, I now understand that it is already in there.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Then I withdraw my request. The only purpose I had was to offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, very likely several gentlemen in the House, perhaps most of you, feel that the abuse which has grown up in this District needs to be stopped and yet feel, perhaps, this is rather drastic. I surely am one of that class. I want to suggest to you, however, this fact—and it seems about the best language that hurriedly can be framed to meet the situation—that it will have this good result, it will compel the immediate consideration of this question and the bringing in in another body of a properly drawn and framed amendment that will stop the vice with as little hardship to the Military Establishment as possible. There is going to be some hardship worked by this if literally adopted and applied. Proper legislation can be proposed by the War Department, and doubtless will be, if some provision is now adopted.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I have only a minute, but I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why can not these officers use motor side cars if they have legitimate business to transact for the Army?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. A motor-propelled vehicle includes a motorcycle. Of course, there are Army officers engaged in military work who need to have automobile service, and should have it, but how to frame legislation that will give needed authority and yet abolish this undoubted vice is difficult to frame.

Mr. MANN. If this amendment goes through, will an officer located at a fort quite a ways from transportation have to walk to Washington?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. They would walk or take a train. Mr. MANN. They can not take a train there.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am inclined to think, like the gentleman from Illinois, that one of the most valuable things we could possibly do would be to stop some of the running about from camps to the city on the part of a great many of these men. It might facilitate demobilization.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does not the gentleman think we ought to strike out the words "carried in this bill," and make this provision immediately effective?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I favor that, but that makes it subject to a point of order, but if some one will offer later the proper language I shall certainly approve of it in that form. This abuse has come to be colossal. It works for inefficiency in the military service. It works for extravagance in government, and it works for everything that is not healthy in the public service. Many officers have themselves been guilty of conduct that brings this drastic action. The higher Army officers are responsible for its existence, and I do not refer to the general in charge of the Motor Transport Service; he has nothing whatever to do with it. Most of you know he is a splendid, high-grade man. The responsibility does not rest there. All he does is to turn over the transportation as orders come to him for such transportation to be delivered. It rests with the highest authority in the War Department. It rests with the Secretary of War's office or somebody in the Secretary of War's office. Now, I want to say to you, you have not cured all the evil by this amendment even. This will not touch a large part of the Quartermaster's Corps, and in the Quartermaster's Corps and depot quartermaster's office in this city you will find automobile abuses that have become serious. It is a vicious system that has grown up, perhaps without any person's willing it, certainly without any authority stopping it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

There is an amendment pending and an amendment to the amendment, and of course the latter must be disposed of before additional amendments are offered. The question is on the amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of the amendment the words "carried in this bill."

The CHAIRMAN. That would be an amendment to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment and the amendment to the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska thereto be again reported.

The amendments were again reported.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move as a substitute—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there was only one amendment reported by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk advises the Chair that he read the amendment to the amendment in.

Mr. MANN. We do not know whether it was done or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report specifically the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska to the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHALLENBERGER to the amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: At the end of the Flood amendment insert the following: "and elsewhere in the United States except those used for the transportation of the enlisted men for military purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARKLEY: Add at the end of the amendment the following: "And from and after the passage of this act no part of any appropriation heretofore made for the maintenance of the Military Establishment shall be used for such purpose."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state the point of order?

Mr. MANN. The amendment as offered relates to appropriations in this bill, while the gentleman seems to have extended it to other appropriations, which is clearly not in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to suggest simply this, that this amendment will reduce expenses. There is nothing speculative about it. It is intended to and will accomplish that purpose, and while it applies specifically to appropriations heretofore made it does not repeal any general law on the subject. It simply limits the expenditure of money heretofore appropriated by Congress.

Mr. MANN. We are dealing with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. We are dealing with a different appropriation, the Chair will say to the gentleman from Kentucky. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER: After the word "purchase" insert the word "hire," so that as amended it will read:

"Provided further, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for the purchase, hire, maintenance, or operation of any motor-propelled vehicle."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "bill" and inserting the word "act." Even then it will be crude enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "bill" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first word of the Shallenberger amendment, "and," and insert the word "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the Shallenberger amendment by striking out the word "and" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "or."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that can not be done by a motion. The Shallenberger amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be offered.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to demonstrate what crude methods we were adopting in enacting important legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] asks unanimous consent that this be done. Without objection, the amendment presented by the gentleman from Connecticut will be agreed to and inserted by the Clerk in the amendment. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For procuring and introducing water to buildings and premises at such military posts and stations as from their situations require it to be brought from a distance; for the installation and extension of plumbing within buildings where the same is not specifically provided for in other appropriations; for the purchase and repair of fire apparatus, including fire-alarm systems; for the disposal of sewage, and expenses incident thereto, for repairs to water and sewer systems and plumbing; for hire of employees, \$5,000,000.

Mr. WALSH and Mr. FREAR rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman if this appropriation includes expenditures for this purpose at military cantonments which have been entrusted to take care of the men raised under the provisions of the selective-service law, or whether it is simply for military forts and reservations?

Mr. DENT. It includes those cantonments that would be in existence during the next year. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15835) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PENSIONS.

Mr. KEY of Ohio, by direction of the Committee on Pensions, presented for printing under the rule the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1071).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 22, 25, 26, 28, and agree to the same.

JOHN A. KEY,

SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

T. J. WALSH,

REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependents of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, viz:

On amendment No. 1 (Sarah B. Green): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 2 (Edward Blackmer): A correction.

On amendment No. 3 (Annie Neate): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 4 (Fred A. Angelo): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 5 (Samuel E. Spencer): Grants \$17 a month in lieu of \$12.

On amendment No. 6 (Edith V. Bowman): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 7 (Grant H. Hill): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 8 (Lindley Herrington): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 9 (Genevra M. Lamb): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 10 (Charles A. Walter): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 11 (Edward P. Aler, alias John P. Edwards): A correction.

On amendment No. 12 (Emma L. Green): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 13 (James P. Dooley): A correction.

On amendment No. 14 (Frances L. Young): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 15 (Fred F. Newell): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 16 (Susan E. Brown): Restores rate of \$25 in lieu of \$20 proposed.

On amendment No. 17 (Henry A. Jaegle): Grants rate of \$17 a month in lieu of \$12 proposed.

On amendment No. 18 (Mary A. Lawson): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 19 (Mary O. Barbee): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 20 (Carrie E. Dennis): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 21 (Lafayette Martin): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 22 (Walter Sewell): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 23 (Addie Burns): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 24 (Mary E. Wainright): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 25 (Rebecca Strouther): Strikes out provision for increase of pension, as she is now pensioned under special act of Congress.

On amendment No. 26 (Belle R. Reid): Strikes out provision for increase of pension, as she is now pensioned under special act of Congress.

On amendment No. 27 (Alice A. Thorburn): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 28 (Wesley H. Crockett): Strikes out provision for pension.

JOHN A. KEY,
SAM R. SELLS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KEY of Ohio, by direction of the Committee on Pensions, presented for printing under the rule the conference report and statement on the bill (S. 4723) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HAYES, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Harlan W. Jenks, H. R. 9434, Sixty-fifth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15835, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15835, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has the floor.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, with reference to my inquiry, do I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs states that the cantonments which have been constructed are known as posts or stations? Is that a correct designation of them?

Mr. DENT. You mean temporary camps during the emergency?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. DENT. Some of them are called cantonments and others are called National Guard camps.

Mr. WALSH. I notice in other sections of the bill provision is made for telephone service and the like at posts, camps, cantonments, depots, arsenals, and so forth, but this item is apparently restricted to military posts and stations. My inquiry is whether any of this money would be expended, or would be available for expenditure, at these cantonments, or whether it would be confined to military posts and stations established before the emergency, and of a permanent character?

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman that of course if any of these cantonments happen to be in existence after the 1st day of next July, this appropriation by law would apply to them. But the committee cut the appropriation more than half in two on the theory that it ought to be confined to permanent military posts in the country.

Mr. WALSH. Is not that quite a generous appropriation, \$5,000,000, for water and sewers and the purchase and repair of fire apparatus?

Mr. KAHN. They asked for \$12,000,000, and the committee cut it to \$5,000,000. I would call the attention of the gentleman to the statement made by Gen. Marshall, on page 204 of the hearings, in which he says:

At many of the Regular Army posts, and at certain of the cantonments which it is supposed will be maintained for permanent occupancy by troops, it is necessary to purchase water from public-service corporations, and it is estimated that the necessary expenditure for this purchase will amount to \$1,799,542, which is 20 per cent of the amount appropriated in the Regular Army bill for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. WALSH. That is very true, but the last prewar appropriation for this very purpose was \$1,500,000. Here we have jumped it to \$5,000,000. Now, if we are going back to a prewar basis—

Mr. DENT. Where does the gentleman from Massachusetts get those figures? I have the figures before me for 1917. It is \$2,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. It was referring to the 1916 item.

Mr. DENT. This was the 1917 appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. Well, even with the 1917 appropriation of \$2,000,000 it seems to me that without some specific explanation and without its being shown that this is to apply to some cantonments which are located an increase of \$3,000,000 is somewhat excessive.

Mr. DENT. That was the reason for the increased appropriation, because it is possible that it might have to apply to some of them.

Mr. WALSH. "It is possible." That is one of the explanations of contingent or possible action.

Mr. KAHN. The department asked for \$12,000,000 for this item, and the committee thought by cutting it to \$5,000,000 they were acting fairly to the soldiers and to the Government.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, the committee has acted fairly and with due generosity, but it seems to me the House ought to know how the money is to be expended and how many of these cantonments are to be made military posts or stations.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is the gentleman from Alabama reading from the Army appropriation act of 1917, in which \$2,000,000 was carried for furnishing water for military purposes?

Mr. DENT. I am reading from the appropriation bill approved May 12, 1917.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That was for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Many of these cantonments then had already been built.

Mr. DENT. Not at the time this act was passed, but during that year.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You were making appropriations for that year, and carried only \$2,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. DENT. I will call attention, Mr. Chairman, to page 733, part 2, of the hearings before the committee, in which a detailed statement is given, showing exactly each item of the appropriation asked for, as follows:

Water and sewers.

Item.	Amount.	Division making estimate.
Water systems:		
237. Procuring water.....	\$2,080,700	Construction.
237a. Purchase of water.....	1,799,542	Do.
237b. Sterilizers and filters.....		General supplies.
238. Introducing water to buildings.....	190,475	Construction.
239. Installation and extension of plumbing.....	1,837,153	Do.
Fire apparatus:		
240. Purchase of.....	100	Do.
241. Repair of.....	418,421	Do.
Fire-alarm systems:		
242. Purchase of.....		Do.
242a. Repair of.....	10,000	Do.
Sewage:		
243. Disposal of.....	490,962	Do.
243a. Expenses incident thereto.....		Salvage.
243c. Incinerators, purchase, etc.....	66,272	Construction.
244. Toilet paper.....	609,500	General supplies.
245. Water systems, repairs to.....	1,898,402	Construction.
246. Sewer systems, repairs to.....	735,082	Do.
247. Plumbing within buildings, repairs to.....	1,677,760	Do.
Total.....	11,724,369	
Cut.....	609,500	
Total.....	11,114,869	

It will be noticed that the total amount there is \$11,114,869, which the committee cut down to \$5,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any sequence in the large appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the purchase of water in view of the adoption of the constitutional amendment?

Mr. DENT. Well, I believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself agree that that amendment ought not to have been adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thoroughly agree. I wondered whether this water was to be still used as chasers for the benefit of those who happen to have stores in their possession after the law becomes effective.

Speaking seriously, what is the need of such large appropriations as \$1,000,000 for the purchase of water?

Mr. DENT. I confess to the gentleman, as I have plainly stated to the committee all during the consideration of this bill, that in the present state of the Army situation and the uncer-

tainty of it, appropriations like this are largely a matter of guess, and that is all you can say in regard to them.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire on another subject which has been considered in a way by the Committee on Appropriations, or, rather, it was referred to in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations: Did the Committee on Military Affairs give any consideration to the purchase of the land on which these cantonments are located, as a permanent policy, or did they merely continue the present proposal to have them under lease?

Mr. DENT. I think I stated on yesterday that the committee had hearings. The Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, appeared before the committee and stated that the policy of the War Department was to purchase all of these various cantonments and to abandon all the National Guard camps except two, one in South Carolina and one in California, for the purpose not of using them as permanent military posts, but of reselling the property, thinking that thereby they could save some money. They asked the advice of the committee, and the committee declined to give any advice on the subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do we understand that under existing law the department has authority to go ahead and purchase the land on which these cantonments are temporarily established?

Mr. DENT. It was so claimed by the Secretary of War.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the committee has not taken any stand in either canceling that authorization or approving it?

Mr. DENT. The committee has taken no action whatever on it.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$5,000,000" and to substitute "\$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FREAR offers an amendment on page 33, line 4, to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the House fully appreciates the position in which we are being placed during the discussion before the committee. Here is a bill reaching \$1,117,000,000, ten times as great as any bill prior to the war, and we have a one-page report on it, that is all; and the House is supposed to gather from that the necessity for this \$1,000,000,000 bill. Then we ask the committee, "What information can you give us?" And then a member of the committee refers to some general statement. For instance, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], whom we all highly respect for his knowledge about this general subject says, "The department wanted \$12,000,000 for this item, but we held it down to \$5,000,000." "It used to be how much?" "A few hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. KAHN. It used to be \$2,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. I am asking that it be made \$2,000,000 now.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. If I can have more time.

Mr. KAHN. That was based on an army of 100,000 men.

Mr. FREAR. But, Mr. Chairman, this paragraph has no reference to 100,000 men or 1,000,000 men. It says:

For procuring and introducing water to buildings and premises at such military posts and stations as from their situations require it to be brought from a distance.

They might spend \$100,000,000 on that item on the same argument in the judgment of these men who have reported or suggested these various items to the committee. Who are to determine the amount at this time when we are demobilizing men or seeking to do it, when we are trying to abandon some of these cantonments and posts? At a time when we have just had placed before us and passed a \$6,000,000,000 revenue bill it is said the estimating officers wanted \$12,000,000, and the committee advised the officers by saying "We can not give you \$12,000,000, but we will give you \$5,000,000," a reduction of about 60 per cent. For what? To include bringing a water supply 50 miles, if desired—to bring water down to any of these cantonments or Army posts. My inquiry is, Why should it be done this year any more than during any prior year? Why should this burden be put on the people this year more than any other year?

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have just reduced the last item \$38,000,000. It has been stated to the House that \$214,000,000 has been invested in motor vehicles. It is needless to discuss the enormous waste in these motor vehicles. That is the same department which asks us to appropriate \$5,000,000 for water and sewers. I ask you who is going to pay for these extraordinary expenditures? Here is a bill appropriating \$1,117,000,000, as I said before, with one small page containing the entire report upon it. Think of it! Why does not the committee give us the information as other committees do on other bills? Then,

when we ask about the necessity for the expense, what do we get? I cast no reflection on the members of the committee, who are acting on the advice of the officers who made the estimates, and the chairman of the committee says it is a "mere guess." He just made that statement to the committee. Of course it is a mere guess.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. No; not at this moment. I will later. This is the first time I have spoken on the bill, and I want to use my time. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interfere with any necessary appropriation, but we have not any positive information on which to base the expenditure. I want to say that I would go as far as anyone in support of what the War Department has done in carrying on the war. I appreciate all that our Army has done to win the war, and during the war voted for everything, but now I believe we should economize.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Not unless you give me more time.

Mr. McKENZIE. We will do that. If the gentleman has no information, how does he have the courage to offer this amendment?

Mr. FREAR. Just because the gentleman from Illinois has failed to give us information, time after time, when he has risen to his feet and has attempted to do it. He has attempted to do it, but he has not given us any positive information. It is a guess even which comes from the chairman. We can not get the information from the committee, because the chairman of the committee says it is a mere guess, as we know it is. Then, why do you say you want \$5,000,000 when it is a guess? I had much sympathy with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] last night when he was offering inquiries on this bill, which only has a one-page report for this, a billion-dollar bill. A few days ago we passed another bill appropriating \$747,000,000, with an authorization of \$400,000,000 beyond that. Who is going to pay all these enormous expenditures? The people; and we are asked to put a tax on them based on a mere guess. Now, I do not know about the necessity. If there is a necessity, it has not been shown. If this provision and the appropriation was good yesterday, it was good 10 years ago. And why this great increase at this particular time? You say we may have to go 50 miles away or 10 miles away to put in this water-supply proposition.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman offers an amendment to make this \$2,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Is that a mere guess?

Mr. FREAR. A mere guess; and so was \$12,000,000, first proposed to the committee; and then the committee guessed and cut it down to \$5,000,000. Of course, \$2,000,000 is a mere guess.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. KAHN. The committee guessed, because it realizes that we must have a supply of water for the various camps for an average of 500,000 men during the year. Before the war we only had 100,000 in the Army all told. We have to buy this water from the municipal water companies all over the Union where camps are located. That is the reason why the committee concluded that we would have to give the \$5,000,000 that the committee decided on. But water is only one feature; there is the fire control which has to be established in cantonments, and they are going to be used for some years. The item includes a number of features, and the committee predicated their estimate on the number of men that we have to take care of.

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama, read to us, and I kept track of the figures, \$3,700,000 for this one item of water supplies, and \$12,000,000 for the paragraph was the basis of that estimate. The committee cut it down to \$5,000,000 for all purposes. The gentleman from California says we are estimating for 500,000 men a year. Well, I will say to him that some Members of this House are not willing to have 500,000 men for the Regular Army, and they want to demobilize the men as quickly as possible. The officers may want to keep them in camp, but we have requests from all over the country to let the men go home.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman recognizes the fact that the men when brought here from the other side have to be sent to the camps and have to remain until they are demobilized, and that during that time they have to drink water.

Mr. FREAR. That is true, but I do not suppose they are to be sent all over the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, pending that request, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of five minutes all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that after five minutes debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended five minutes? There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Let me say that if the chairman and other members of the committee take my time I shall not have a chance to say much, but I am glad to yield to any member of the committee.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman know that the War Department sends these soldiers who come back from the other side to the various cantonments to be demobilized?

Mr. FREAR. That was the suggestion of the gentleman. I know a case where officers were brought back from the other side, landed at Hoboken, and told to pay their own way home.

Mr. KAHN. That was the case of an individual officer.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; of individual officers. Let them put the men in the first and nearest camp and demobilize them as soon as possible, and not send them to southern and western camps, where there is no water supply.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Well, now I want a few moments; you will not give me another five minutes under the restriction. You gentlemen have talked hour after hour, and this is the first time I have spoken on the bill.

Mr. KAHN. But the gentleman is making a misstatement.

Mr. FREAR. I have made no misstatement. I say it is true you can not send men to California and demobilize them. We want them demobilized as quickly as possible, and it is not necessary to spend \$3,700,000 to get water supplies brought a good many miles to cantonments and camps, and we know it. That proposition is as sensible as a great many other propositions in this bill. Of course, I know no more about the necessity than does the chairman of the committee or the members of the committee. The committee has cut down the estimate of \$12,000,000 to \$5,000,000; why not cut it \$3,000,000 less in this item and make it \$2,000,000, as it was before? If we are going to enact legislation, put it at the amount it was before the war. We have got 10 times as much for this bill as we had prior to the war, and it is about time that we began to economize somewhere along the line.

Mr. McKENZIE. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. FREAR. I would be willing for the gentleman to interrupt me if he could give me any information.

Mr. McKENZIE. I can.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman can not, I am afraid, because the chairman could not do it and the gentleman from Illinois has not done it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I simply wish to state to the gentleman from Wisconsin who I know desires to be fair—

Mr. FREAR. Quick, quick—give me the question—I have only five minutes.

Mr. McKENZIE. The Committee on Military Affairs felt that we would not have 500,000 men in the Army from July 1, 1919, to July 1, 1920, and we therefore cut this appropriation.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; and we ought not to have over 100,000 men here, or 200,000 men in the Army, and the average man in this House if you give him a chance to vote will say that; and we are not going to get our men back from Europe and we know it—a million men will be there for many months to come. Yes; you will have them there on the first of July, and much longer, and we know it; no matter what promises are made on this floor, and we may be sure of it. I asked a member of the committee a question this morning whether it is not true that Gen. Foch asked Gen. Pershing to keep 1,000,000 men over there, and gentlemen shake their heads, that it is not true, but they do not know any more about it than I do. I hope it is not true and if true will not be done. We know this, that 175,000 men were demobilized in three months according to the statements of the Military Committee chairman, and at that rate it will take two years and a half to bring these men back from Europe—it is purely a matter of computation. We want the men back, we do not desire these big cantonments. We may want them for other purposes in the future, but the people to-day I feel sure do not care to spend \$5,000,000 for water supply and for other purposes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I would like to, but I can not yield. Think of the absurdity of coming to this House, an intelligent committee as you are—and we will not question the individual or collective capacity of the committee—and bringing in a one page report on a bill carrying \$1,117,000,000, when we only appropriated \$100,000,000 before the war!

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Ten times as much as it was before the war, and then when we ask what are the facts in a particular case, what do we learn? You read from the report and say: "This is the guess," and the guess here is \$5,000,000 largely for a water supply. Let us leave out these new water supplies, bringing water from a long distance, and let us continue the work of demobilizing our troops, and reduce the military establishment as rapidly as possible. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman makes his comparison constantly with the peace establishment—the peace basis.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am sure the gentleman's sense of proportion does not warrant him in abiding by his own word.

Mr. FREAR. I can not yield for an argument.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not think you can; I think you have proved it conclusively.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, well; the gentleman wants to make an argument in my time as other members of the committee do. I am asking for information and seeking to prevent the riot in expenditures which is apparent in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLOTHING AND CAMP AND GARRISON EQUIPAGE.

For cloth, woollens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for sale at cost price according to the Army regulations; for payment for clothing not drawn due to enlisted men on discharge; for altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary; for equipment and repair of equipment of laundries, dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops, and garbage-reduction works; educational propaganda in connection with reclamation; for equipage, including authorized issues of toilet articles, barbers' and tailors' materials, for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment, and issue of housewives to the Army; for expenses of packing and handling, and similar necessities; for a suit of citizens' outer clothing, to cost not exceeding \$10, to be issued upon release from confinement to each prisoner who has been confined under a court-martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge; to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison; and to each enlisted man ordered interned by reason of the fact that he is an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without internment; for indemnity to officers and men of the Army for clothing and bedding, etc., destroyed since April 22, 1898, by order of medical officers of the Army for sanitary reasons, \$4,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. VARE and Mr. KNUTSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the committee adopted an amendment curtailing the expenses in respect to the use of automobiles upon the part of officers, especially in the District of Columbia. Judging from my observations in Philadelphia and elsewhere, we ought to go considerably further in this curtailment of extravagance. I wish to read to the House a part of a letter from a soldier in France which I received from one of my constituents. He inclosed to me a letter written to him by his son, dated December 12, 1918. The son is in the Motor Transport Service. I wish to read a part of that son's letter:

To show you the waste, the commanding colonel, Hageman, had a special car made, all but the engine. The whole body is aluminum; inside of the coupé is the best Russian calf leather, special heating apparatus, Goodyear cord tires all around, Cadillac eight motor. It certainly is a magnificent job; makes everything I have ever seen yet look poor. It is easily worth \$9,000, and the whole car made by the men in the shops here—all privates, too, which shows the ability of the men working here. He can have all the luxury, and the men who do the work are compelled to live and eat like hogs. Just had a bath opened here. Been here since last April, and no washing or bathing facilities. Yet the colonel and all his officers can live like kings at the Government expense. What I have seen here convinces me this war has made a bunch of rich men and a bunch of thieves. It certainly is a crime to see all the waste where it is not necessary.

The young man who wrote that letter has been serving in France during the war.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have an amendment which I would like to offer to the bill, but after looking at it I am convinced that it is not germane. However, I introduced a bill covering the situation which I have in mind in relation to these soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been wounded. We are going to settle our moral obligations with the contractors, and I think we owe a moral obligation to the soldiers, sailors, and marines who were wounded or injured. I have introduced a bill to provide for the payment of certain sums of money to those who were injured in the line of duty.

We have voted to settle our moral obligation with the munition manufacturers and mineral producers who remained safely behind the firing line, and the question now is whether we are going to settle our moral obligation with the soldier who went 3,000 miles from home and went over the top and was injured. Will we be as good and generous to him as we have been to the fellows who remained at home?

The soldier asks nothing but a square deal at your hands. Soldiers freely offered their lives for their country, and now some are dead and have left dependents; some were wounded, lost arms, limbs, eyes, hearing. Some are nervous wrecks and will never recover their health. Some are blind and never will see again. Some will never be able to work and earn a living. Do not you think we owe a moral obligation to them that we ought to settle? Their bravery ended the war much sooner than it otherwise would have ended, and saved billions of dollars to this country. Will Congress be as generous to these maimed and wounded men as it has been to the contractors? Will we give these men help as freely as we voted to give \$100,000,000 to the people of other countries? I hope so.

We have voted to settle our moral obligations with the munition manufacturers which will cost over a billion dollars. We have voted to settle our moral obligations with the wheat grower, and that will cost, so it is stated, another billion. We have voted to settle our moral obligations with the mine owners that will cost a good deal. Congress is getting so that it does not like to pass a bill that does not carry at least a billion dollars. How are we going to adjust the moral obligation we owe the man who lost his hand, his arm, his limb, his eyes? Are we going to settle with him?

I have introduced a bill that I hope will pass, that will give to each wounded soldier in addition to his war-risk insurance benefits sums ranging from \$5,000 for total disability down to lesser sums for lesser injuries. This would give him an opportunity to set himself up in some business. This would give him an opportunity to buy a home or a farm located somewhere near civilization. This country can never repay these men for what they have done for their country, but we should go as far as we can in placing them statu quo.

Would anyone take the chances they took for \$5,000? They did. It seems to me it is very poor pay for taking such chances. Many of these men left dependent widows and orphans. How are we going to settle our moral obligation to them? My idea is to pay to these injured men a lump sum as a gift to them for what they did, just as we are going to pay a lump sum to contractors for what they did do, but in some instances did not do.

There is talk of getting a farm and giving it to the soldier. How can a man with no legs operate a farm, or how can a man with no arms operate a farm?

I think people were under the apprehension that when their soldier relatives were killed they got the total amount of the insurance at once, but such is not the case. Let us give to the dependents of the soldier who died for his country the sum of \$5,000. Let us give to the soldier who lost both legs or both arms or both eyes the sum of \$5,000. Let us give the soldier who is totally disabled the sum of \$5,000. Let us give the soldier who suffered a lesser loss other sums, and when we have done this we have in a small way paid a small sum on the moral obligation we owe the soldier who went over the top.

Had these men been in civil occupations they could have protected themselves against accidents and protected their families. Many of these wounded men will soon be discharged from the hospitals as nearly well as they ever will be. Are we going to throw them upon the world to compete with whole men? What they receive under the war-risk insurance will not be enough to keep them, and they will have to go to work, and they will have to compete with whole men.

It would be a national scandal if we settled our moral obligations with everybody but the man who went over the top. It is no time now to count the cost, for it would have cost more had they not turned the enemy back. They saved democracy; they saved civilization; they saved the honor of this Nation. I know of no more moral obligation this country owes

than its debt to these immortal men. We can never pay it entirely; let us try to pay it in part.

The following is a copy of an act introduced by me to-day:

A bill to allow certain sums to soldiers, sailors, and marines who were injured in the line of duty.

Whereas Congress has now under consideration measures for the relief of manufacturers, contractors, and corporations of various and divers production and construction to compensate them for losses claimed by them through the unexpected signing of the armistice; and

Whereas the moral obligation we owe to the soldiers, sailors, and marines who went "over the top" in order to save not only our Nation but likewise the corporations now seeking adjustment of large claims: Therefore

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in addition to any sums paid or to be paid soldiers, sailors, and marines under an act entitled and known as the war-risk insurance act, or any other act, there shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated the following sums to soldiers and sailors and marines who were injured in the line of duty, and to the dependents of those who were killed in action or died while performing their duty:

First. To the dependents of a soldier, sailor, or marine who was killed in action the sum of \$5,000.

Second. The following sums shall be paid for total or partial disability: For total disability, the sum of \$5,000; for loss of both hands, the sum of \$5,000; for loss of both feet, the sum of \$5,000; for loss of sight of both eyes, the sum of \$5,000; for loss of sight of one eye, the other having been lost before enlistment, the sum of \$5,000; for loss of one hand and one foot, the sum of \$4,000; for loss of hand or foot, the sum of \$3,000; for loss of arm at or above the elbow or leg at or above the knee, the sum of \$5,000; for loss of either a leg at the hip joint or an arm at the shoulder joint, or so near as to prevent the use of an artificial limb, the sum of \$3,000; for loss of leg at hip joint, \$3,000; loss of arm at shoulder joint, the sum of \$3,000; for loss of or total disability of both hands, the sum of \$5,000; for total disability in both feet, the sum of \$3,000; for total disability in one hand and one foot, the sum of \$4,000; for total disability in one arm or leg, the sum of \$3,000; for total disability equivalent to loss of hand or foot, the sum of \$3,000; incapacity to perform manual labor (first class), the sum of \$5,000; incapacity to perform manual labor (second class), the sum of \$4,000; frequent and periodical, not constant, aid and attendance, the sum of \$4,000.

This act shall be carried into effect by the Secretary of the Treasury through the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraw the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. No. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. On page 33, lines 16 and 17, what is the necessity for the language, "educational propaganda in connection with reclamation"?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the language.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that that will not go out; and I would like to be heard for a minute, because I know something about what is being done.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am seeking information; I withhold the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the gentleman going to make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Unless I can be convinced that it is really necessary.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not want to talk just to hear myself talk. If gentlemen are determined to make the point of order, it is useless to say anything.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am reserving it to obtain information which the gentleman from Minnesota has in his possession.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, Congress has been thinking about enacting legislation that will produce important benefits to the discharged soldiers and sailors of the Army and Navy. The Secretary of the Interior has recommended a piece of legislation most comprehensive in outline. It is being considered at both ends of the Capitol, I believe. To promote this project is possible under this language, and work of this character is now being undertaken in a proper way. The purpose is to acquaint the soldiers with their rights and opportunities under such laws of the character indicated as will be passed.

Now, it is wholly ineffectual to enact legislation that is of the comprehensive character contemplated if the beneficiaries are never going to find out what their rights and privileges may be, and it seems to me that the work that is proposed to be done under this will be directly beneficial to the soldiers. The purpose is to do something of a practical character to help the returning soldiers. That is all I have to say. It calculates to bring to discharged soldiers and sailors the knowledge of the terms of the laws and the rights which they have under them. It is proposed to meet the men as they disembark, meet them in demobilizing camps and similar places, to inform them relative to the opportunities existing under contemplated legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand existing practice, the War Department has ample authority to bring to the attention of soldiers all orders, regulations, and other information they seek to convey?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. This is, of course, extraordinary; this is not confined to the ordinary—

Mr. STAFFORD. This is propaganda; it is not information.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Well, that is true; but propaganda is nothing but information properly distributed.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It may be just the opposite.

Mr. STAFFORD. In view of the information furnished by the gentleman from Minnesota, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota make the point of order against the entire paragraph?

Mr. STAFFORD. Against the clause contained in lines 16 and 17, page 33.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNUTSON: Page, 34, line 10, after the figures "\$4,000,000," insert:

"Provided, That any person who served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war may, upon honorable discharge and return to civil life, permanently retain one complete suit of outer uniform clothing, including the overcoat, and such articles of personal apparel and equipment as may be authorized, respectively, by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and may wear such uniform clothing after such discharge: *Provided further*, That the uniform above referred to shall include some distinctive mark or insignia to be prescribed, respectively, by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, such mark or insignia to be issued, respectively, by the War Department or Navy Department to all enlisted personnel so discharged. The word 'Navy' shall include the officers and enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard who have served with the Navy during the present war: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall apply to all persons who served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps during the present war honorably discharged since April 6, 1917. And in cases where such clothing and uniforms have been restored to the Government on their discharge the same or similar clothing and uniform in kind and value as near as may be shall be returned and given to such soldiers, sailors, and marines."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order. This bill has passed the House once and has passed the Senate. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama insist upon his point of order?

Mr. DENT. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. KNUTSON. I want to make a statement if I can.

Mr. FOSTER. I demand the regular order. The bill has passed the House once.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. Does the gentleman make the point of order of no quorum?

Mr. KNUTSON. I move to strike out the last word, and I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his point of order of no quorum.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is high time that we realize that the war is over, and the time for making huge expenditures without question or examination should be a thing of the past. For 19 months I sat in this Chamber and voted for every dollar deemed necessary by the administration for the successful prosecution of the war. We all did, for we wanted to do everything possible to gain a speedy and glorious victory. But, my friends, hostilities have ceased and the war, to all intents and purposes, is over. I want to vote every dollar necessary, but from now on I shall demand to be shown the necessity for every appropriation asked for. As the representative of a quarter of a million of free people who will have to help pay these enormous debts by sweat and toil and sacrifice, that is my plain duty, and it behooves every Member of the American Congress to help cut out all unnecessary appropriations.

Let us see what kind of a start we are making toward getting onto a peace footing. Here we are asked to make an appropriation of nearly \$2,000,000,000 to be expended upon our Army during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920. Think of it, gentlemen, \$1,916,000,000, or more than the entire cost of maintaining the Government during the year preceding our entrance into the war. We are also asked to authorize a standing army of 500,000 men and 28,000 officers. True, it is only to be temporary, or, at least, we are so told; but, my friends, I have

noticed that most, if not all, of these temporary arrangements become permanent.

We have to-day in this country a powerful clique who wish to perpetuate militarism in the United States. A large standing Army means what? It means the annual expenditure of millions of dollars that could be better used in building good roads and for other internal improvements; also in reducing our enormous national debt.

My friends, the American Army has been Prussianized, and it fairly reeks with injustice. Within the past two days Congress has been wrought to a white heat over the astonishing revelations of injustice and brutality existing in the courts of the Army as made before the Senate Military Committee by Gen. Samuel T. Ansell, Acting Judge Advocate General of the Army. His testimony showed that a most glaring condition of injustice exists, and I desire in my brief time to refer to some of them, as reported from the hearing by a Washington newspaper:

DEATH FOR REFUSING TO DRILL.

Here are a few, not isolated, cases cited by Gen. Ansell as disclosing the system of punishment followed by the Army during the war:

The death penalty was imposed upon an American soldier in France who pleaded guilty to a charge of refusing to obey an order to drill. The soldier insisted he was ill and physically unable to obey. The military authorities in France demanded execution of the man, but he was saved by Executive clemency.

A court-martial sitting in this country ordered the death penalty inflicted upon a soldier who went to the bedside of his dying father without leave. He returned to duty as soon as his father died. The man was saved by interference from Washington.

FORTY YEARS OVER CIGARETTES.

A sentence of 40 years was imposed upon a young soldier by a court-martial a few days ago because he refused to give up a package of cigarettes to his superior officer, a second lieutenant. "A company row" was the way Gen. Ansell characterized the incident, blaming the officer practically as much as the soldier.

A soldier convicted of having a pass in his possession was sentenced to dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of pay, and imprisonment for 10 years. This was later reduced to three years. The soldier has already served two months, and Gen. Ansell recommended the suspension of the remainder of his sentence.

Dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of pay, and 40 years' imprisonment, afterwards reduced to 10 years, was the sentence pronounced upon a man for absenting himself without leave.

FIFTEEN YEARS FOR SEEING SICK BABY.

A private who went home without leave to see his wife and sick baby, in destitute circumstances, was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. This was later reduced to three years.

While the Secretary of War was insisting upon a strict adherence to the system which made such sentences possible, according to Senator FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, a policy of the utmost leniency was being applied to "conscientious objectors" who refused to fight.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN told the committee he was receiving large numbers of letters from troops in the camps complaining that the conscientious objectors were being dealt with lightly; that they were being discharged and sent home with "a new suit of clothes and a bouquet in their buttonhole."

WANT BAKER TO EXPLAIN.

"What has been the policy of the War Department toward the conscientious objectors?" asked Senator FRELINGHUYSEN.

"May I be excused from answering?" asked Gen. Ansell. "It would be embarrassing."

"The Secretary of War can tell us about it; we'll have him up here and ask him," Senator CHAMBERLAIN said.

"Maybe he'll have objections," commented Senator KNOX, of Pennsylvania.

"Conscientious, I suppose," observed Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Gen. Ansell's testimony brought to light a bitter feud which has been raging in the War Department for many months over the powers of the Judge Advocate General's Office to review and modify the findings of courts-martial.

DISPUTE OVER AUTHORITY.

Gen. Ansell asserted that the cases of injustice became so numerous and flagrant during the war that he made a careful reexamination of the powers of his office and discovered an old law, passed in 1862, which he interpreted as giving him authority of revision and review.

Gen. Crowder, the regular Judge Advocate General, disagreed with him in this view, holding that the Judge Advocate General had no such authority, and the Secretary of War sustained the position of Gen. Crowder. Gen. Ansell presented several briefs to uphold his contention and admitted that he had found it necessary "to break away from the practice which the strict ruling of the Secretary would have required."

ACCUSES STAFF OF ABSOLUTISM.

In one of his briefs he charged the General Staff with "professional absolutism" and called the system of dispensing justice "an anachronism."

"That is rather broad language," the general said to the committee, "but justice required that I fully state my views."

What finally forced the issue in the War Department over the powers of the Judge Advocate General's Office in court-martial cases was the instance of 12 noncommissioned officers dishonorably discharged and sentenced to imprisonment of three to seven years each because of a minor dispute with a young lieutenant just out of West Point, the general explained. He declared the procedure in this case "unfair."

ANSSELL SHOCKED BY SENTENCES.

The general told the committee that the Judge Advocate General's Office was "full of strange inconsistencies," and that its practices were "without thoughtful consideration of the law."

Gen. Ansell stated that he could recall several instances where his recommendations in court-martial cases were turned down by the General Staff and the Secretary of War. The courts-martial, he said, were dominated by the commanding officer which convened them.

"Sentences have been imposed," said Gen. Ansell, "that have shocked my every sense of justice. Some of them have reached the very height of injustice, bearing no reasonable relationship to the offense committed."

SYSTEM CREATES BOLSHEVISTS.

Gen. Ansell related the case of a young soldier, enlisted on October 28, who was tried by court-martial on November 23, less than 30 days after he had entered the Army. The soldier had been detailed to kitchen duty. A second lieutenant caught him smoking a cigarette, which is against the rules while a man is on kitchen duty. He ordered him to turn over the entire pack of cigarettes. The soldier demurred in rather vigorous language. He was tried by court-martial and sentenced to 40 years' imprisonment.

"Any system that will permit a thing like that is absolutely un-American," burst out Senator THOMAS. "It will make Bolsheviks out of all that man's relatives."

Gen. Ansell said he hoped when the convening authority saw his recommendation in the case he would take some rather drastic action. But, he added, he knew of an equally flagrant case where the court refused to reduce below 10 years an original sentence of 40 years.

MEN EXECUTED WITHOUT APPEAL.

While the controversy was raging in the War Department over the extent of the Judge Advocate General's authority, men were actually being executed without the slightest opportunity for an appeal for clemency. As an instance of this, Gen. Ansell cited the case of the Houston riots. Negro troops were tried in several groups. The first group of 15 was tried and executed a few hours after sentence of death had been passed. No notice of the action of the court-martial was given to the Judge Advocate General's office.

The general was asked for a comparison between the American court-martial methods and those of the armies of other nations.

He declared they were much harsher than those of Great Britain and France; in fact, he said, they were harsher than any except the armies of Russia, Prussia, and Spain. He called the methods "intolerably severe."

DEATH FOR VISITING DYING FATHER.

When Gen. Ansell gave his list of horrible examples of injustice in the findings of courts-martial, he was frequently interrupted by indignant outbursts from Senators. One convening officer, he told the committee, gave himself credit with great leniency because he reduced from 40 to 10 years the sentence of a soldier convicted of being absent without leave for several days.

"Very tender-hearted gentleman," commented Senator THOMAS.

The general related in detail the case of a young soldier who went home without leave to see his dying father. He hurried back to camp as soon as his father died, and was sentenced to death. The sentence was not carried out because of Executive clemency.

MOST INJUSTICES IN UNITED STATES.

"You should have court-martialed the court-martial," said Senator KNOX.

"The court-martial couldn't see the human facts behind that case," said Gen. Ansell.

"What ever became of that boy?" Gen. Ansell was asked. He didn't know.

"His mother probably has joined the Bolsheviks," said Senator THOMAS.

"And his father probably has, too—in another world," commented Senator FREELINGHUYSEN.

Most of the instances of injustice occurred in the United States, but the general cited some from France, too.

THIRSTED FOR MORE POWER.

He told the committee the American military authorities in France were dissatisfied with their powers in court-martial proceedings and wanted the War Department to enlarge the number of cases under which the death penalty could be inflicted without reference to Washington.

Two men in France were tried for sleeping at the post of duty. They had been on duty all night for five consecutive nights and could not sleep in daytime because wood was being chopped in their dugout for the commanding officer's quarters. They were sentenced to death and were saved only by the narrowest margin because of the insistence of the military authorities in France on carrying out the sentence.

DEATH SENTENCE ON OWN PLEA.

Two other men were sentenced to death because they refused to obey orders. One of them refused to obey an order to shoulder his rifle for drill. He declared he was physically unable to obey the order because of illness. The other man merely pleaded guilty and was sentenced to death on his own plea, the general stated.

The Judge Advocate General's office has examined between 18,000 and 20,000 court-martial cases.

We went into this war to "make the world safe for Democracy." Democracy, indeed! That phrase, as employed by the War Department, is an empty and meaningless one. According to Gen. Ansell, who, by the way, appears to be one of the very few men high in military authority who possesses a heart, the court procedure in our Army is much harsher than in that of Great Britain and France; in fact, it is comparable only with that of Russia, Prussia, and benighted Spain. A fine comparison, indeed, and one that is only too true, I fear.

My friends, this bill may pass because it carries some very necessary items of appropriation; but if the proposition to provide for an Army of 508,000 men and 28,000 officers were put up to this Congress in a separate measure it would fail of passage by a large majority. The American people fear militarism above all things; and if this Congress votes to fasten it upon them there will be many new faces in the Sixty-seventh Congress. Militarism is the one thing we went into this war to crush. They feel that our geographical situation is such that a National Guard Army is the thing for us. It is more democratic and is devoid of the heartlessness of the Regular American Army. The War Department has studiously tried to do

away with the National Guard, and it has about succeeded in its purpose. Secretary of War Baker, that man who has been heralded over the land as a man of the people, is one of the greatest autocrats in the annals of American history. His heart swells with sympathy for the "conscientious objector," but the fighting men who went through all the horrors of the Gehenna in France can appeal to him in vain.

The time has arrived to democratize the American Army—better still, replace it with the National Guard, so far as possible. If we do that we will make an important step in retrenchment of our expenditures.

But, gentlemen, I have been digressing. I started out to speak of the enormous expenditures we have been making and the necessity for pruning all appropriations down to the bone. I propose to do my share by my vote. I voted against the appropriation of \$100,000,000, which it was alleged was to be used to feed the starving people of Europe and which has been charged was to be used to relieve the food manipulators. I voted against the Naval appropriation bill for the reason that it provided for the needless expenditure of several hundred million dollars, and if I live I shall vote against this bill, if the provision for an army of a half million men is retained. The entire bill is largely guesswork on the part of the War Department. It seeks unnecessary authorizations to buy cantonment and camp sites, automobiles, and God knows what not. Right here in Washington we daily see scores of Army automobiles—yes, even limousines—containing high officers, going about at break-neck speed, a soldier at the wheel. All this is a useless expense. We have enough camps and cantonments to fill our every need. If these officers wish to go joy riding, let them do as the rest do—hire taxis or furnish their own.

There is another matter of which I would speak. Mr. Chairman, there are in this country thousands and thousands of young men in the Army who are needed at home to put in the crops, to work in shops and stores, and many more who gave up their studies to don the uniform. It is my firm conviction that the boys under arms in this country should be demobilized forthwith. They wish to leave the service, and their retention is a useless expense and works a grave injustice. I have in mind the case of a young man stationed in a southern camp who held a responsible position in a bank before entering the service. Some two months ago the officers of the bank petitioned for his discharge, saying that his services were badly needed in the bank, and it would not be possible to hold his old position open for him much longer. The application was rejected, the young man's position has been filled by another, and when he returns from the service he will find his job gone. I ask you, is that giving our soldiers a square deal? Another case: A widow living on a large farm in central Minnesota. Before the war she and her two sons ran this farm. One of the boys was drafted, the other remained on the farm. Last fall the latter died from influenza. She wrote to me asking if her soldier boy could not be discharged so that he could return home and help with the farm work. I immediately wrote his commanding officer but to no avail. The War Department tells us that under circular No. 77 such cases will be favorably acted upon. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that the officers in command want to hold onto the boys so they can hold onto their jobs, and they can get away with these tactics so long as we continue to make appropriations to carry on the work.

If we are a democracy, let us proclaim it in deeds rather than by empty, meaningless phrases. Let us also have a little of that "pitiless publicity" of which the Democrats spoke with so much feeling during the campaign of 1912 and of which we have seen so very, very little since March 4, 1913. Let the administration remember what Abraham Lincoln said about fooling the people all the time. It still holds true, and the day of reckoning is not far off. Personally, I will welcome with all my heart the day when the mask is torn aside and we shall behold things just as they are. Let us give just a little more consideration to the American people, even if it be at the expense of aliens.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of the item "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 10, strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I trust I may have at least one minute without being disturbed by the members of the commit-

tee, who, I know, understand all about the subject, according to their own judgment.

We have \$4,000,000 proposed in this paragraph. The last item that was agreed to first asked for \$12,000,000, and it was cut to \$5,000,000 by the committee. This paragraph provides for educational propaganda in connection with reclamation, and for equipages and including the issuance of toilet articles, barber tools, and so forth. And turning to page 34 we find:

Each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered interned by reason of the fact that he is an alien enemy.

I do not know whether or not this relates to the item for the support of the men who have been confined in Leavenworth, and concerning whom the Senate committee is trying to ascertain what they were sent there for. I do not accept without question the judgment of a department that permits men to be sent to Leavenworth and kept there over and above the protest of the man who wanted to pass upon the courts-martial's findings, Gen. Ansell. I do not accept their statement without some question in my mind. Men have been sent to Leavenworth for 15 years, aye, practically for life, for trivial offenses by these same officials, and the War Department, according to the investigation, has refused to permit a review, excepting through certain channels, and that investigation is going on to-day, and my attention has been called to it by the fact that men who are at Leavenworth—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. For a question.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Has the gentleman ever heard of a single case that has been reviewed and the sentence imposed reversed?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know as I have. I read on the floor of the House the other day of a case where a boy went home to see his dying mother. I read it here. And a man who served on the court-martial wrote me—a man who served at Chateau-Thierry and bravely fought there—that he was the only man that voted against sending the boy to Leavenworth for 15 years. The Senate is revealing these cases constantly. I have asked to have this item of \$4,000,000 cut in two. There may be a guess coming, as was suggested. But with a bill that is ten times as large as any bill prior to the war, it seems to me we are entitled at this time to question some of these items.

Let me read briefly just one paragraph from a letter which came to Mr. GALLIVAN from Germany, and which comes from two boys from my home State, who wrote him complimenting him upon his work here on the floor of the House, and which has resulted in good. They say:

We have been in France over one year and have been at the front from May, 1918, until the signing of the armistice. We realize that all can not be the first to reach the United States, and we are willing to abide our time in the true American spirit if we knew that a fair system of discharge was established whereby those longest in service and who have suffered the hardest experiences may be the first discharged.

The policy seems to be the contrary. These officers suggest it is an honorary distinction with the army of occupation or Rainbow troops. But I think I can safely say they want to get home and can not get home. Letters come every day from relatives asking for their return, and from men themselves. The policy seems to be to hold these Wisconsin and Michigan men and these Illinois men, the Rainbow Division, over there as a mark of distinction and honor. They have served their country and have helped to win the war. They fought well. They should be brought home as a testimonial of their distinguished service and among the first troops that should be returned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HORSES FOR CAVALRY, ARTILLERY, ENGINEERS, ETC.

For the purchase of horses of ages, sex, and size as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War for remounts for officers entitled to public mounts for the Cavalry, Artillery, Signal Corps, and Engineers, the United States Military Academy, service schools, and staff colleges and for the Indian Scouts, and for such Infantry and members of the Medical Department in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto, \$100,000: *Provided*, That the number of horses purchased under this appropriation, added to the number now on hand, shall be limited to the actual needs of the mounted service, including reasonable provisions for remounts, and unless otherwise ordered by the Secretary of War, no part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster Corps and an inspection under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War. When practicable, horses shall be purchased in open market at all military posts or stations, when needed, at a maximum price to be fixed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any horse below the standard set by Army Regulations for Cavalry and Artillery horses, except when purchased as remounts or for instruc-

tion of cadets at the United States Military Academy: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for polo ponies except for West Point Military Academy, and such ponies shall not be used at any other place.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois rose.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to obtain more information than was given by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], when a question relative to the session was asked by the Member from New York.

I do not understand why \$100,000 should be appropriated to buy horses, when there are now 90,000 for sale, as the Government advertised. Let me read two or three lines:

The animals offered for sale are being disposed of at public auction to the highest bidder, and sales are being conducted on account of the fact that the surplus on hand is far in excess of the number required for the needs of the Army during times of peace.

One bureau claims in time of peace we do not require more horses. And yet at the same time the Military Committee has reported a bill carrying over a billion dollars for war purposes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is a fact, I may state from my own personal knowledge, that the Government has sold thousands of horses for about one-quarter, and sometimes even more than one-quarter, of what it paid for them.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I have no doubt of that. We are appropriating \$100,000 to buy horses, possibly from the same persons who purchase them from the Government sales.

Mr. DENT. I can answer the question, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. DENT. It was not intended, although the language is carried authoritatively for the purpose—because that is the usual language in the bill—to make any purchase. The reason the committee limited this appropriation to \$100,000 was simply to expend that money for breeding purposes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. It does not say so. It gives the Secretary of War authority to buy horses at the camps. He can expend all of the \$100,000 if he deems wise, and buy back horses that are sold by the Government. It does not seem to me that the committee has given much attention to the philosophy of political economy.

Mr. DENT. Of course, the Secretary of War could do a lot of things here that he ought not to do and will not do.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized for five minutes in my own right, if the gentleman has finished.

Some years ago it was almost impossible to get good Army horses, and therefore the military officers in charge of that branch of the service negotiated with the farmers of the country to raise for the Army horses that could be utilized for military purposes. They told the farmers that if they raised the right kind of horses the Government would buy them when they became 1 year old. After they were bought, the colts were sent to the various remount stations of the War Department and trained for military purposes.

Now, this provision is intended simply to enable the Government of the United States to carry out its promise to the farmers. That is all that there is in this provision. Under the agreement that the Army officers have made these horses will be tendered to the Government.

Mr. WALSH. Under what authority did the Army officials or the War Department enter into contracts?

Mr. KAHN. As I recall, about the time that the question of securing military horses became acute there was a provision inserted in the Army appropriation bill, or some other bill, which allowed the officials of the Government to enter into agreements to buy the colts. What is more, some public-spirited gentlemen turned over to the Government a number of valuable stallions that could be loaned to the farmers for breeding these various horses.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I deny that there is any such contract with the Government.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If my colleague will permit me, there is a provision carried in the regular annual Agricultural appropriation bill which takes care of the breeding stations. There is one in my district, at Weybridge, Vt., and that seeks to furnish suitable horses of the Morgan type for military purposes.

Mr. KAHN. Yes. I believe the item has been carried in the appropriation bill for allowing the breeding of those horses, and the War Department has been getting the colts for military purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds—

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. This is to correct an error in the bill. On page 34, line 21, I think the word "purchases" should be changed to the word "purchased."

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a misprint.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that the word "purchases," in line 21 of page 34, be changed to the word "purchased."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Page 34, line 21, strike out the word "purchases" and insert the word "purchased."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I would like to offer, which will take 10 minutes if I can get the extension of time.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to have two minutes.

Mr. DENT. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. DENT. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, I think I shall need 10 minutes if the chairman can let me have it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama amends his request and asks that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, a few days ago I read into the RECORD a copy of some resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of my home city, Grand Rapids, calling for the immediate recall of the American troops in Russia. I hold in my hand some petitions signed by between 600 and 700 citizens of Holland, Mich., which is also in my congressional district, along the same line. I will not ask to have the names on these petitions inserted in the RECORD, but I would like to read into the RECORD the caption of the petition. I read:

We, the undersigned parents and citizens of this country, respectfully petition the United States Government that it use every possible means for the speedy return of our soldier boys who are stationed in Russia. We are interested in their welfare, and realize that under present conditions in that country, our boys being outnumbered by the opposition, they are not able to stand the strain. We sincerely trust that the Government will do its utmost to heed our request.

As I said, there are something over 600 signers to these petitions. The State of Michigan is unusually interested in the American forces in Russia because the bulk of the forces there come from our State, and a great many of them from the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. It is a matter in which we are so much interested that I take this way of bringing it to the attention of Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman inform me whether mail communication is at all frequent; for instance, between constituencies in Michigan and the American troops in Russia?

Mr. MAPES. My understanding is that the Red Cross says there is mail going in and out twice a week. But the fact is I have received many letters from the parents of the boys over

there saying that they have not heard from their boys for months and months.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If a letter from Michigan went out, when would an answer be anticipated?

Mr. MAPES. It is very difficult to tell. It would take several months at best before an answer would be received.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman permit me to read just briefly from Frazer Hunt's report? He was sent over to Russia by the Chicago Tribune. In his report he says:

The American troops were put under an absolute imperialistic command, being handled in a way that was against every tradition of the Army and country. They were put to doing a king's business, and to do whatever task was assigned to them by the British.

The resolution introduced in the Senate yesterday on this subject lost out by a tie vote, the Vice President voting against it.

Mr. MAPES. I am familiar with the report referred to by the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Why does not the gentleman have it inserted in the RECORD?

Mr. FREAR. I shall be very glad.

Mr. KEARNS. Why not have these boys brought back from Russia?

Mr. MAPES. If there was any way of getting a resolution before the House to that effect I would like to have it considered. As the matter stands now, it is entirely in the hands of the President. I have considered the constitutional power of the President to send them there. I suppose he has the power and the right to send them there as Commander in Chief of the Army, and certainly if he had the right to send them there he has the right to bring them out.

Mr. KEARNS. We have not declared war against Russia, have we?

Mr. MAPES. No; and if we could get Congress to declare some policy on the subject, the President might be inclined to follow it.

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will yield, I have also here a list of the casualties among the American troops in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk began the reading of the amendment.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment. It is obviously out of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, can a point of order be made against an amendment until it is read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Speaker has decided that where it is apparent from what has been read that an amendment is out of order the point of order may be made before the whole amendment has been read.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order, so that the matter can be discussed?

Mr. GORDON. I will not. There has been altogether too much time wasted on irrelevant matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that this identical amendment was offered last night and held out of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Page 35, line 14, after the word "place" insert:

"That article 11 of the Articles of War is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Art. 11. Appointment of judge advocates: For each general or special court-martial the authority appointing the court shall appoint a judge advocate. No person shall be appointed judge advocate for a general court-martial unless at the time of his appointment he is an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department, except that where an officer of that department is not available the authority appointing the court shall appoint an officer of the Army recommended by the Judge Advocate General as specially qualified, by reason of legal learning and experience, to act as judge advocate. The officer appointed as judge advocate for a general court-martial shall not be a member of the court, but shall sit with it at all times in open session and shall fairly, impartially, and in a judicial manner perform the following duties and such others not inconsistent herewith as may be prescribed by the President in virtue of article 38 of the Articles of War.

"(a) Rule upon all questions of law properly arising in the proceedings;

"(b) Advise the court and the convening authority of any legal deficiency in the constitution and composition of the court or in the charge before it for trial;

"(c) At the conclusion of the case and before the court proceeds to deliberate upon the finding sum up the evidence in the case and discuss the law applicable to it, unless both he and the court consider it unnecessary;

"(d) Take care, equally with the court, that the accused does not suffer any disadvantage in consequence of his position as such, or of his ignorance or incapacity to present his own case, and for that purpose the judge advocate, with the permission of the court, may call and examine such witnesses as may appear to him necessary or desirable to elicit the truth.

"His rulings and advice, given in the performance of his duties and made of record, shall govern the court-martial.

"If the judge advocate dies, or from illness or any cause whatever is unable to attend, the court shall adjourn and another judge advocate shall be appointed by the proper authority, who shall act as judge advocate for the residue of the trial or until the judge advocate returns."

"Sec. 2. That article 17 of the Articles of War is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ART. 17. Appointment of prosecutors: For each general or special court-martial the authority appointing the court shall appoint a prosecutor, and for each general court-martial one or more assistant prosecutors when necessary. The prosecutor of a general or special court-martial shall prosecute in the name of the United States and shall, under the direction of the court, prepare the record of its proceedings. Such prosecutor may be an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department. In all court-martial proceedings the accused shall have the assistance of and be represented by counsel of his own selection. Such counsel may be either a civilian lawyer or an officer of the Army. If military counsel be not selected by the accused, the court shall assign military counsel to assist in his defense if such counsel be reasonably available."

"Sec. 3. That articles 22, 30, 33, and 116 of the Articles of War are hereby amended by substituting the word 'prosecutor' for the words 'Judge advocate' wherever they appear in the said articles, and by substituting the words 'prosecutor or any assistant prosecutor of a general or special court-martial' for the words 'The judge advocate or any assistant judge advocate of a general or special court-martial' wherever they appear in the said articles.

"Sec. 4. That if the authority authorized to appoint general courts-martial has an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department present for duty on his staff, he shall not refer any charge to a general court-martial for trial unless the said officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department shall indorse in writing upon the charge that in his opinion an offense made punishable by the Articles of War is charged with legal sufficiency against the accused, and that it has been made to appear to him that there is prima facie proof that the accused is guilty of the offense charged.

"Sec. 5. That article 18 of the Articles of War is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ART. 18. Challenges: Members of a general or special court-martial may be challenged by the accused, but only for cause stated to the court. The court shall determine the relevancy and validity thereof, and shall not receive a challenge to more than one member at a time: *Provided*, That if the accused at any time before the arraignment shall file in the proceedings an affidavit of prejudice alleging specific grounds to show that the court by reason of matters touching its constitution or composition can not do justice, the court shall proceed no further in the case, but shall report the matter to the appointing authority for his decision."

"Sec. 6. That when a court-martial shall find the accused not guilty upon all charges and specifications it shall not reconsider, nor shall the appointing authority direct it to reconsider, its findings; but the president of the court or the summary court shall immediately inform the accused and the officer by whose authority he may be in custody of his acquittal, and such officer shall thereupon immediately release the accused from custody, unless he is in custody for reasons other than the pendency of the charges of which he has been acquitted.

"Sec. 7. That section 1199, Revised Statutes of the United States, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1199. The Judge Advocate General shall receive, revise, and cause to be recorded the proceedings of all courts-martial, courts of inquiry, and military commissions, and perform such other duties as have been performed heretofore by the Judge Advocate General of the Army. The power to revise the proceedings of courts-martial conferred upon the Judge Advocate General by this section shall be exercised only for the correction of errors of law which have injuriously affected the substantial rights of an accused, and shall include—

"(a) Power to disapprove a finding of guilty and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense when the record requires such finding;

"(b) Power to disapprove the whole or any part of a sentence;

"(c) Power, upon the disapproval of the whole of a sentence, to advise the proper convening or confirming authority of the further proceedings that may and should be had, if any. If upon revision, under this section, all the findings and the sentence be disapproved because of error of law in the proceedings, the convening or confirming authority may lawfully order a new trial by another court-martial.

"Sentences involving death, dismissal, or dishonorable discharge from the service shall not be executed pending revision. If in any case a sentence though valid shall appear upon revision to be unduly severe, the Judge Advocate General shall make a report and recommendation for clemency, with the reasons therefor, to the President or the military authority having power to remit or mitigate the punishment."

"Sec. 8. That the Judge Advocate General of the Army shall prepare and submit to Congress, at the earliest practicable date, a revision of the Articles of War consistent with the provisions of this act, and shall also prepare and submit to Congress a draft of regulations providing for the procedure of general courts-martial.

"Sec. 9. That all laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

No one but an incurable optimist would insist on trying to amend the military bill now under consideration so long as it is apparent that the administration is not in a mood to do any-

thing to assist the common, ordinary doughboy; but I insist on coming up smiling every time the administration steam roller flattens me out, secure in the knowledge that after March 4 this "outfit" will receive a good many new replacements, and that after March 4, 1921, there will be two or three platoons of replacements here that will have some sympathy for the men in the fighting branches of the service.

It is easy for me to understand the reason for the lack of interest that this administration has in the doughboy, because, so far as I have been able to find out, and I am familiar with the facts, not one relative of anyone connected with this administration was ever allowed to become one.

At that point I want to draw a distinction between the administration and the boys from the great southern part of the United States, because the flower of the South enlisted in the Army just as soon as war was declared. They did not care what war it was, but wanted to fight on the side of the United States against any enemy, and the record will show that these fighting southern boys were real men and patriots. The records are the same from every State. Time is too short to mention them all, but I want to call attention to the Fourth Alabama; a fighting outfit which took a great deal of boche artillery at St. Mihiel. These boys just loved to fight, and were so full of vitality that if they could find no one else to argue with they would dispute among themselves. It has even been said, and I believe truthfully, that they threw offensive French hand grenades at each other just to keep in training for the big "parties." I saw a bunch of these Alabama boys at Base Hospital 23 at Vittell, and the only thing that worried them at that hospital was the fear that they would not be able to get back into the fighting line. This was just as true of the boys from Virginia, the Carolinas, Mississippi, and every southern State, and no man who ever saw them operate could fail to realize why it took the North so long to subdue the South—it was necessary to smother it by numbers. [Applause.]

The flower of the South was in the war, and the families of the names that are familiar among the Confederate veterans were all represented. The sons and brothers of governors, Members of Congress, and State officials were there, and I love them and praise them for the good things that they did. [Applause.]

Sometime when the soldiers of the North and the soldiers of the South are gathered together in the organization, which they will inevitably form to keep alive their recollections of this great war, I hope some men from the North will open the doors of that organization to the daddies of these southern boys who fought for the Confederacy, because their blood helped to win this war; and then I hope that some soft-voiced southern boy will open the door to the members of the G. A. R. who fought for the Union; and then we can see these gray-haired men in their fraternity of spirit fighting again the battles of liberty with their sons. [Applause.]

But, I repeat, that it is impossible to get anything from this administration for the doughboy, because no son or relative of anyone intimately connected with this administration was allowed to fight. This is a broad statement, and I am waiting here now for any of these spokesmen who always represent the administration to point out one relative of anyone closely connected with this administration who was there or who appears on any casualty list. Facts are facts, and you might as well meet them, and it is a shame that these clean-cut American boys were prevented by their fathers or mothers and the administration here at Washington from getting into the fight as they would have preferred to have done. It is an outrage that they were not permitted to make the same record that the rest of the boys of this country could make. Some of the relatives of the wives of the Cabinet officers were wonderful men and performed wonderful service, and I desire to eliminate them from this statement.

One of the Cabinet members who has been very prolific in his statements that the world must be made safe for democracy allowed his son to chase submarines on Chesapeake Bay, and finally, on September 3, landed at Bordeaux, France, and was sent to a town 40 miles from there for training. I know this boy, and he is a real boy and wanted to get in it and fight; but would they let him? I should say not. Within a week after his arrival that great colonel of the American Expeditionary Forces, Col. House, wired for him to come to Paris and go on the colonel's staff. His pass expired in a few days, and he returned to his outfit, but again this doughty colonel ordered him to Paris, and after a short trip to Germany to secure souvenirs he is now carefully guarding the person of the colonel from any intrusion.

Another bright and capable son of a Cabinet member has been retained in this country and not even allowed to put to sea. I know of that young man, and know that he would be a fighting

man if he had the chance. His father or mother or the administration were careful to see that he was never taken on a destroyer or allowed to get in danger. Yet, to be fair, I will say that there is one exception, in the son-in-law of our President, who enlisted in the Y. M. C. A., and, if I remember correctly, was somewhere in France for a week or two, and the newspaper reports that a shell fell within a few yards of him, greatly jeopardizing his future career.

And then to expect that this administration would do anything for the doughboy except to preach to him. Why, they would not even allow my friend Ollie Newman, one of the bravest young men that ever wore the uniform, and whom you all remember as a former Commissioner of the District of Columbia, to get within smell of powder. They sent him as the official chaperon of the President's daughter when she began singing for the doughboys.

There surely were some rough spots in this war for the poor doughboy, and he will never forget it.

I dislike to criticize, because it is so easy; but I can not help but realize that there are but two royal families in the world who never suffered nor appeared in the casualty lists—one was the royal family of Germany and the other the royal and reigning families of the United States. If I am wrong, I hope some one will stop me and set me right.

I was not allowed to offer the amendment reforming court-martial procedure which I desired to offer, and I will close simply by saying that if these official gentlemen are not willing to take the chances, or allow their sons to take their chances in the war, they ought to allow the men and their relatives who were interested in this war and took some part in it to have reform in the court-martial procedure in the United States. It is a vital thing. Some of you may have read the testimony given before a Senate committee by Gen. Samuel T. Ansell, of the Judge Advocate General's office, a few days ago. I simply want to say that he did not go far enough in his statement, and I want to serve notice at this time that if anyone in the War Department or anywhere else takes exception to his statement or desires to start any course of action which will bring any punishment upon Gen. Ansell, there is one man, in addition to a lot of others in this Congress, who will resent it and will see that appropriate action is taken. [Applause.]

Any time that under that system of procedure a soldier can be sentenced to death or to 40 years' imprisonment for refusing to drill, the system should be remedied. When a poor boy is absent without leave for a few days to see his dying father, and can be sentenced to 40 years in the penitentiary for that offense, that system should be changed. When a poor boy who has only been in the service 23 days refuses to turn over a package of cigarettes to a second lieutenant who has no right to them, and gets sentenced to 40 years' imprisonment for that, that system ought to be changed. That second lieutenant had no more right to ask for that package of cigarettes than I would have to go over to Uncle JOE CANNON and try to pry out of him against his will the cigar that I know he has in his pocket. When a poor private soldier can be sentenced to 40 years in the penitentiary because he happened to have in his pocket a pass that belonged to some other boy, that system ought to be changed.

Whenever you can sentence a man to 15 years in the penitentiary for going home to see his sick baby, that system ought to be changed. These are facts and only a small part of them, and we ought to act now while these men are in Fort Leavenworth, although I am prohibited by the administration from bringing in an amendment before the House so that we can send some little ray of hope to the boys confined there. They will get no relief except that which will come to them by the commission appointed by the Secretary of War.

I am not attacking the Secretary of War, for I do not think he is responsible for the system. The system grew up and made it possible for these boys to be sentenced, and makes it possible for thousands of other boys in France and the United States to be sentenced as these men were. Why? Because the administration which controls the legislation at this time will not let it come before this House for a vote. And so you will never get done hearing of this amendment, and the amendments introduced yesterday for the good of the fighting men will plague you until 1920, and you will all be so sorry they were not considered that you will wish you had never heard of them before. [Applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: Page 34, line 20, strike out "one hundred thousand" and insert "ten thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Page 34, line 20, strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$10,000."

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because there has been no evidence that the Government has written contracts with farmers or breeders of horses to purchase animals for remounts. It has been stated by a distinguished Member of the House that such a contract does not exist. We have for sale at Camp Fort Bliss 5,702 horses; at Camp Bowie, 2,456 horses; at Camp Hovey, 3,811 horses; and thousands more at 26 other camps. This amendment will save \$90,000 to the taxpayers. It will not be very much, but it will be a commencement in the proper direction toward economy, and will leave \$10,000 that can be utilized for the purchase of horses for special need. Therefore I hope my amendment will prevail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DENT) there were 33 ayes and 18 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BARRACKS AND QUARTERS.

For barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration of office buildings, sheds, shops, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of troops, public animals, and stores, and for administration purposes, except those pertaining to the Coast Artillery; for construction of reclamation plants; for constructing and repairing public buildings at military posts; for hire of employees; for rental of the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, on duty with the troops at posts and stations where no public quarters are available; of barracks or authorized allowance of quarters for noncommissioned officers and enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, retired enlisted men, and members of the enlisted Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty; for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes; for the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits; for such furniture for the public rooms of officers' messes and for officers' quarters at military posts as may be approved by the Secretary of War; for wall lockers in permanent barracks and refrigerators in barracks and quarters; for screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, and window shades for barracks, offices, and quarters, and for flooring and framing for tents, and for the National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, \$4,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. FREAR. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what is the necessity for constructing public buildings at military posts?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 21, page 34, the words "constructing and."

Mr. WALSH. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and make another.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the entire paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. I want to ask the chairman what is the necessity, on page 36, line 6, "for ground for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops," and so forth? I assume that that means in addition to what has already been acquired. Are they going to build more cantonments?

Mr. DENT. No; this is only intended for repairs.

Mr. WALSH. But the bill does not say for repairs.

Mr. DENT. The hearings so state it.

Mr. WALSH. I know; but the bill is the product of the committee after the hearings have been held. It is not in the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I interject an inquiry at this point?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama if the construction of barracks at Panama is not still in progress, and some of this appropriation is to be utilized for that purpose?

Mr. DENT. Yes; I understand so.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Then the words "for construction" ought to be retained in the bill. I know these barracks were under construction a short time ago, and I assume that they are still under construction and should be continued.

Mr. WALSH. I wish the gentleman from Alabama would answer the question I propounded.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman from Alabama has stated that some of this is to be used for the purpose of continuing the necessary barracks at Panama Canal Zone, and if that is so, the words "construction and" should remain in the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is mistaken in his statement.

Mr. WALSH. The Panama Canal construction does not come within this paragraph.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It might.

Mr. SHERLEY. There was an estimate submitted for certain barracks and quarters at Panama before the Committee on Appropriations. They used to be carried in the sundry civil bill. We threw all those matters in connection with the defense of the Panama Canal into the fortifications bill, and there is in that bill something like \$4,000,000 for the construction of barracks and quarters at Panama.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I was mistaken in my statement.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I gather from the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky that all expenditures for building in the Panama Zone—hospitals, barracks, and so forth—are provided for in the fortifications bill and not in the military bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I would not make the statement that broad; but the barracks and quarters that I recall—and I have not had charge of the fortifications bill for more than a year past, and my memory is not, therefore, very fresh—have been appropriated for through a bill brought from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. Barracks and quarters for the Ordnance Corps only.

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. MANN. Carried in the fortifications bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. They were carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill. Provisions for barracks and quarters have been carried for years in the sundry civil appropriation bill, relating not only to Panama but to many other places, and this year those relating to Panama were thrown, along with the fortifications estimate, into the fortifications bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman assure us that in the fortifications bill there will be an item continuing the construction of the necessary barracks at Panama?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is an item, but for nothing like the amount asked for. They ask for something like \$12,000,000. I think the subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] is a member, allowed something like \$4,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Four million dollars for barracks and quarters for two regiments of Infantry.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, on page 35, line 21, to the words "for constructing and," and, on page 36, lines 6 and 7, 8 and 9, to the words "for grounds, for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order and wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to the necessity for the authorization for the construction of reclamation plants which is to be found in lines 20 and 21, on page 35.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman insists, I am perfectly willing to have the words go out.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order against them.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the Quartermaster Corps has organized a new feature of its service. Instead of throwing away old shoes and old clothes, they are turned in and are reclaimed. They are renovated and then they are reissued, and I take it that these buildings are necessary for the work of reclamation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, upon the information furnished by the gentleman from California, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Just to say to the gentleman that the various Congressmen who have gone abroad say that the English reclamation plant is one of the most wonderful plants in the whole army and saves an enormous amount of property. I suppose this is designed for the same purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. The wording led me to believe that it had something to do with what is known generally as reclamation projects in connection with irrigation. On a previous page there was a provision for educational propaganda in connection with reclamation, and perhaps that may have related to irrigation or may have related to this very proposal of salvaging material.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama, in charge of the bill, if the War Department has adopted any policy with reference to the existing cantonments. What are they going to do with them?

Mr. DENT. I made that statement once this morning.

Mr. LEVER. I am sorry I was not here; and if the gentleman made the statement, I shall look it up.

Mr. DENT. I would be very glad to repeat it.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000" at the conclusion of the paragraph on page 36.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 18, strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have been studying this report very carefully to find something in regard to these various propositions, and while I admit the page is very enlightening in some respects, I have not discovered anything in regard to polo ponies, for which we appropriated in the last paragraph, for the use of West Point Academy. We have just adopted an amendment in respect to the use of automobiles by the military officers here in the city and elsewhere, preventing such use. We all have had the experience and know what it means, and it has created indignation on the part of the House, so much so that the House passed the amendment unanimously. Here as a matter of military instruction we have provided in the last paragraph for polo ponies, and yet Members wonder why it is that these boys whom we send to West Point, because they are our boys that we send, sometimes become so arrogant. The arrogance shown by frightful penalties at courts-martial or when, as was suggested yesterday, they attempt to determine social distinctions, as has been done for 40 years. We wonder why it is. These officers are just as good boys as can be found in any community; but we all know it is the training they receive and the sentiments of their surroundings. There are many of them who come out of that institution and go through the service as good men or better than when they went in; but some do not, and it is from those that we hear largely. When Congress in these days is appropriating money for polo ponies, I think you may inquire who is to pay for these polo ponies.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The item for polo ponies has been carried in the regular standing Army appropriation bill for years, and the purpose of providing polo ponies at West Point is for the instruction of cadets in horsemanship and—

Mr. FREAR. Well—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, if the gentleman does not want any more information, well and good.

Mr. FREAR. I have got that, and I remember that Theodore Roosevelt, when he was President of the United States, provided for horsemanship by saying that officers should take long rides, and a vigorous protest arose in every post against the order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the gentleman refuse any further information?

Mr. FREAR. I would like to get on the paragraph now under consideration. We have passed the polo-pony paragraph.

We have already discussed the reclamation plan which, I understand, is for the rehabilitation of old shoes, old clothing, and things of that kind, and, if that is true, there will be no one to question it. The explanation for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, has not been made intelligible to Members of the House, so far as I understand. After spending much money—hundreds of millions of dollars—for cantonments of the South and elsewhere, and for the construction of buildings and for camp sites, this bill still provides in this section for grounds for cantonments and camp sites and for other military purposes. On page 36, line 10, we provide for lodging for recruits, which is not objectionable, surely. In the same line we find "for such furniture for the public rooms of officers' messes and for officers' quarters as may be approved by the Secretary of War." We do not provide furniture for the recruits, the doughboys, for whom the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] recently spoke, but we are providing for the officers. I do not object particularly to it, except at this time I do not believe there is any justification for voting \$4,000,000 here upon the information which has been presented to the committee. Let me say, referring to the report again, this report of one page states that the estimate for \$1,916,905,000 was received by the committee in the middle of January. The committee shaved that estimate down, after a great deal of tedious work, to \$1,117,289,000, which is ten times, let me remind the committee, ten times the amount of any military bill ever offered in this House before this war was upon us. Every item here, in the judgment of those who presented the \$1,916,000,000, every item has been increased, so far as I can understand, over what it was in former years about a thousand per cent, and for that reason I believe we ought to have a reduction in this amount in times of peace.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds, may I submit a unanimous-consent request that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall terminate at the expiration of seven minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, during this war we constructed 16 cantonments, built to accommodate something like a total of 700,000 men. We already had in the United States a large number of forts and places for troops. It is proposed by this bill to provide for an Army of 500,000 men. This provision is for barracks and quarters. Now, then, having provided in the beginning of the war new quarters which will accommodate 700,000 men, how can there be necessity, with the quarters already provided, for expending \$4,000,000 for additional quarters for 500,000 men?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If the gentleman will permit, of course the committee does not appropriate any money for any additional quarters. The department asked more than the \$4,000,000 for repairs and upkeep of quarters that we now have. There is not any of this money to be used for any other purpose than the maintaining the tremendous investment which we now have.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I take it that this bill was drawn as bills ordinarily are drawn, that it was brought up to this committee from the department, and the bill as it is drawn now does not stand as it did before the point of order was made upon construction. The bill as drawn and as presented to this House and as it stood until about five minutes ago provided for construction, and the item of construction was undoubtedly the largest item. We have the paragraph as a whole, and we find that the paragraph as a whole provides for minor things, small things which would not eat up or grow to anything like millions of dollars, and the only thing which could grow into millions, the only thing which could involve millions, was this question of construction which has gone out on the point of order; and I say how, then, can you explain the fact that when upon this paragraph construction seems to be the thing which is large in its figures and large in its expenses, how can you explain that fact when you have ready and provided cantonments for 700,000 men and you will need quarters during the coming year for only 500,000?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If the gentleman will permit, \$20,000,000 was asked by the department for this particular item, and the item of construction was over \$6,000,000. The committee struck out the construction item entirely and did not consider it, and the item was reduced to what we thought would be the very limit that could be used for the maintenance of the tremendous investment which the Government has in this enterprise. Now, it is not only cantonments but every Army post in the United States that is taken care of by this bill. All of its great investments in great permanent military posts all over the United States are taken care of in the way of repairs, and the gentleman can easily see that construction, as far as that is concerned, only comes in as, for instance, at one of these great Army posts there is a possibility of their needing the construction of some very small buildings, which would only cost a few hundred dollars; but take Army posts like we have at Fort Sam Houston or the Presidio—

Mr. DEMPSEY. I get the gentleman's idea.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman allow me to read the basis of the estimate to the gentleman?

Mr. DEMPSEY. One moment, if the gentleman will let me make a suggestion first.

In other words, the gentleman's answer to my proposition that you do not need new construction is that we need repairs. And I will say to you in answer to that proposition it can not be true; that where you built last year your buildings have not so depreciated in the course of one year, or really a few months, that they are going to need repair. It is all new construction. It will be good for a great many years. You can not possibly need extensive repairs at this time. You may need them some time in the future, but you can not need them now.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is true that they ask for the construction of barracks quarters the enormous sum of \$38,000,000. I ask the gentleman's attention to this language as found in the estimates:

The amount asked for, \$4,272,090.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the order made, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will read:

The amount asked for, \$4,272,090, is what is considered to be necessary for minor extensions and small buildings added for special purposes to camps and posts already existing.

Now, mark this language:

The necessity for such work is constantly arising, and while the list of projects which seem absolutely necessary at the present time only amounts to \$300,000, it is sure to develop that many such items of construction will be necessary to properly care for the number of men which the revised program provides for.

Now, may I inform the gentleman further, that this item carried \$400,000 during peace times, before the European war? Well may we cut this item down to \$2,000,000 in view of the statement which I have just read.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will supplement what the gentleman has read by this: As I understand it, we have new cantonments ready to care for 700,000 men. They are new, and they do not need repairs. We have old forts which shelter a greatly increased number over their capacity before the war. I happen to have one of those forts in my district, and I know they were put in good condition; that they were repaired and large additions made to them last year. Judging from the fort I have seen, and taking that as a sample, I would say that no construction work would be necessary for 5 or 10 years. Why then, with quarters for a much larger Army than we are estimating for; why then, with all of this construction work done freshly and newly, not needing repairs for a great many years; why then, having appropriated heretofore only \$400,000, we should, with all this new work just freshly done, appropriate \$4,000,000 is beyond my comprehension. And I believe the gentleman's estimate of \$2,000,000 is excessive instead of being inadequate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I agree entirely with the gentleman; and I ask if anyone can give an explanation of why we should have an appropriation for more ground for cantonments when we are abandoning them right along?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is one of the items that has been struck out on a point of order, and it must have entered into this estimate, and when it was struck out on a point of order it lessened the estimate and the amount necessary just that much.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that only two minutes more are left for debate under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LITTLE. I was to have a couple of minutes.

Mr. DENT. Yes; the gentleman was to have a couple of minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. I have been informed recently by what appeared to be reliable authority that there is a fort on the Yukon River that cost \$1,000,000, that the War Department had built and, I believe, never occupied, and which is now totally abandoned, and that every year we appropriate something for the care of that. Does the chairman happen to be familiar with that fortification and the circumstances?

Mr. DENT. No; I am not.

Mr. LITTLE. Would you mind looking it up? I would like to know. The gentleman who gave me the information had been in Alaska. He says it is not only totally abandoned but it is entirely out of the range of travel, and the War Department actually came down here and held this Congress up for a million dollars to build it but have never used it, as I understand him, and is not using it now. And he says there is an appropriation made every year for its maintenance. I wonder if that gets in under this?

Mr. DENT. I am pretty sure that there is no estimate made for that in this paragraph.

Mr. LITTLE. I wish you would look that up. I might say to the gentleman from New York, the War Department does not need the money for repairs or for construction. It just needs the money.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the two minutes left will it be in order to offer an amendment, because I want to discuss some items in the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. To offer an amendment to the paragraph?
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. When the time under the agreement is disposed of it will be in order for the gentleman to offer an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will I be permitted to offer an amendment if I wish to offer one separately?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not care to occupy the two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 30, noes 25.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Or is the time fixed?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has expired on this paragraph.

Mr. FERRIS. Very well; I will wait until the next.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY POST EXCHANGES.

For continuing the construction, equipment, and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations for the conduct of the post exchange, school, library, reading, lunch, amusement rooms, and gymnasium, including repairs to buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902, for the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits, and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established, or which may be hereafter established, and for such purposes not enumerated above as the Secretary of War may deem advisable, to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$250,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. FERRIS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. FERRIS. I want to be recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to proceed for a couple of minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to speak on his reservation?

Mr. WALSH. Not if the gentleman from Oklahoma desires to proceed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, what is the gentleman's request?

The CHAIRMAN. His request is to proceed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have been waiting here longer than the gentleman from Oklahoma, with a burning desire in my breast to proceed. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. I will withdraw.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WALSH. I want to inquire about the item for continuing construction at military post exchanges—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he must not interfere with the proceedings of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was not in any way interfering with the proceedings of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts was in the act of proceeding and was recognized by the Chair. The Chair asks all other Members not to interfere with the proceedings.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was not interfering with the proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was trespassing upon the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts will proceed in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee what construction work is being carried on at the military post exchanges?

Mr. DENT. No construction work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, if there is no construction work now being carried on, what is the necessity of carrying an appropriation to continue it?

Mr. DENT. I have no objection to its going out.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, on the item, on page 36, for continuing construction of military post exchanges.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order that a number of gentlemen are now standing, to whom the attention of the Chair has not been directed. [Laughter.] I ask for a ruling on my point of order that the House should be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I demand a ruling of the Chair on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has instructed the Clerk to read. The gentleman, in the judgment of the Chair, is out of order.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I have no objection to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Alabama, if I may. I notice the language reads, "For the rental of films, purchase of slides, supplies for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits," and so forth. Can the gentleman inform the House as to the method which the Army follows in procuring slides and moving-picture films for very proper purposes, as indicated here? I am inquiring as to how they get their films and where they get them.

Mr. DENT. I do not know where they get them.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Most of the films, as we know, are made by certain institutions whose business it is to make films. Does the War Department purchase or rent these films or does it have a corps of officials who go out and make films? I will be more specific if the gentleman wants me to.

Mr. DENT. I wish the gentleman would be.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I have been informed that during the period of the war—I do not know whether it now exists or not—this has been the practice: The Committee on Public Information, using Government funds which they secured from one source or another, has had an enormous quantity of pictures taken, going into various parts of the world for that purpose. They then lease these films to the Y. M. C. A., to the Red Cross, and to the Army cantonments at a very high rental, and thereby they have been enabled to reap quite a large harvest in the way of funds.

Now, of course, that sort of procedure is entirely unjustifiable, and if it is the intention that that practice shall be followed now I shall certainly make a point of order against it; but if it is intended that the War Department shall get their material in the ordinary and proper way no one will have objection to it.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The branch of the War Department having charge of that particular line of work came to us asking for quite a large appropriation. The committee rejected that request, and the only place in this bill from which funds are made available for the procuring of films is the particular item here, relating to post exchanges. The gentleman knows that at these exchanges these films are hired or purchased the same as they are in other public entertainments, and are used for the entertainment and amusement of the soldiers at the posts. There is no fund in this bill to be used for such a purpose as the gentleman describes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not know that during the past two years they have procured their films in the general way I have mentioned, but I do know, or at least I have been advised by persons who claim to know the facts, that the Committee on Public Information has been making a very large sum of money by simply taking Government funds and having pictures taken, and then renting these pictures to other branches of the Government.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Of course, the gentleman knows that the Committee on Public Information does not get its funds from this committee.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. This place that I have referred to, so far as this committee is concerned, is the only place from which money could be had for the use in these post exchanges. It is right here, as has been stated. That is the information secured by our committee.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is it the information of the gentleman, then, that any expenditures made under this paragraph will be made in the way he intimates?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And not by what I might call polite and legalized graft to the Committee on Public Information.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is the information I have—that this is going back to the plan they had before the war.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Then I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIEGEL: Page 36, line 25, after "1902," insert: "and buildings for similar purposes on military reservations authorized by War Department regulations."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, the buildings erected at private cost under the act of May 31, 1902, were the buildings erected by the Y. M. C. A. When war was declared the Knights of Columbus, the Jewish Welfare Board, and the Salvation Army erected at the various camps a large number of buildings, costing several millions of dollars, open to all soldiers, sailors, and marines of all creeds. Last year was added the proviso found on page 25, lines 12 and 13, of this year's bill—

And buildings for similar purposes on military reservations authorized by War Department regulations.

That is, providing for their light and heat. We carry the same proviso this year. But somehow or other this language was not added for the military post exchanges, and this amendment simply gives to those buildings, without a cent of extra cost to the Government, the same right of incidental repairs which is given to the Y. M. C. A. buildings at the present time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the act referred to, approved May 31, 1902, provides for buildings erected by the Y. M. C. A.?

Mr. SIEGEL. Correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is the purpose of this amendment to extend the privileges of this item to other buildings?

Mr. SIEGEL. For similar purposes—open to every one.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire whether the point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] was sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; as to the words "continuing the construction."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] made the point of order, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] conceded it, and the point of order was sustained.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I simply wanted to be certain that that was out of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to make his point of order against the words "for continuing the construction, equipment."

Mr. STAFFORD. Not against the word "equipment," but just against the construction.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was to the words "continuing the construction," on line 20, page 36. That point was conceded by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BARRACKS AND QUARTERS, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Continuing the work of providing for the proper shelter and protection of officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States lawfully on duty in the Philippine Islands, including repairs and payment of rents, the acquisition of title to building sites, and such additions to existing military reservations as may be necessary, and including also shelter for the animals and supplies, and all other buildings necessary for post administration purposes, and for shelter and repair thereof, and rentals for the United States troops in China, \$250,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, so that I may ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes as if I had moved to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, while the item "for barracks and quarters" was under discussion I desired to discuss that subject, but owing to the parliamentary situation which arose I was unable to do so. What I wanted to do was to draw attention to the conditions which prevail at certain of the points of debarkation in France, notably at Brest. Not long since a vessel arrived in the port of Philadelphia. She was the *Haverford*, the first vessel to come to that port with troops from France. That vessel contained a number of officers and a larger number of enlisted men who had done faithful and gallant service on the other side of the water. A number of the officers and men who came from abroad on that ship, being still in the service, were unable to make public statements. That is one of the real disadvantages that a man in the Army suffers; that while he still wears the uniform he is subject to the regulations and discipline which the War Department imposes. I presume that is the proper thing; but these gentlemen, many of them officers, communicated to those with whom they talked upon this occasion, and this did not get into the newspapers of Philadelphia. They stated that the "cooties" and the rats and the mice in the trenches were paradise compared with the quarters they were obliged to subsist in at Brest. From December 27 to January 14 they lived in tents with water 5 inches deep in some of them. Why they were put in the tents instead of in the barracks no one seems to know. The matter, however, has been reported to Washington, and I am told that some of the officers when they are released from their uniforms and from Army discipline intend to tell this story to their Congressmen. Yesterday we had some very interesting discussion on this floor with regard to the propriety of a Member of Congress interceding in an Army matter in behalf of his constituents. I trust that these gentlemen who are coming back from Brest, these officers and privates, when their uniforms are off, will be free to communicate with their Members of Congress in order that we may understand better the conditions that prevailed abroad.

I have received a number of letters bearing upon this situation at the points of debarkation in France. One of the men who has written me, whose letter I received this morning, is well known to most of us here in Washington. I will not, I dare not, at this time give his name, but his statement is sufficient for me, and I vouch for him.

He states that the wounded and sick soldiers returning from the fields of France to the ports there are forced to ride in dirty freight and cattle cars to the ports of embarkation, where they are kept in anxious suspense for days and weeks to get a boat home. They are fortunate if they have a shelter over their heads. This gentleman tells me he can not speak from personal experience of the conditions at Brest, Bordeaux, or Marseilles, but he tells me that as to the conditions at St. Nazaire, where he was for two weeks waiting for a boat, he can speak. He says others have been kept there for five or six weeks. He was fortunate enough to get away in two weeks. He says they had roofs over their heads but no floors, and mud and sickness all around.

That is to say, they were obliged to sleep upon the ground, and many of them to sleep in mud. To be sure, it is the rainy season in France, and these muddy conditions prevail. But, gentlemen, here are our boys over there clamoring to come home. Here we are making an appropriation for an additional Army of more than 500,000 men. Here we are asking when will these 2,000,000 soldiers come back? The answer is they are crowded up against the ports in France; they are sleeping in the mud; the very tents which shelter their heads do not have floors to shelter their bodies as they sleep. Yes; these may be extreme cases, but it seems there are many of them.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. SIEGEL. I have here a photograph of Brest that has come through and which the gentleman can use.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am sorry I can not put it into the Record. The gentlemen who would like to see it are privileged to come to the rostrum and examine it. I have no doubt it is correct, for it is a series of photographs. I say to you there is great unrest in regard to the Army of the United States, and I am sorry to say the unrest is increasing and is due to the fact that these men in uniform, who are suffering untold agonies, are unable to tell their stories to their Congressmen and the home folks. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee

and not entitled perhaps to speak along that line. I am not in favor of putting any gag in these boys' mouths to keep them from talking or writing to Members of Congress. They should have the right made secure to them. I am not in favor of the present procedure of the Judge Advocate General's office where they put extraordinary and extortionate sentences for trivial offenses on these soldier boys. But neither of these are new proceedings to the Military Establishment; neither of these systems are new to this Congress or to this administration. They are very old. They are too old. I am not in favor of reading here on the floor of this House all these carping criticisms during the consideration of this bill. It is neither the time nor the place. Neither am I in favor of Congress resolving itself into an old ladies' commission of carping critics to stir up trouble for those who are conducting the war. Gentlemen here may think it serves a good purpose. It may, but I fear it does positive harm.

It is not my purpose to lecture anybody, but I do not believe that we ought to have 20 or 30 Members of the House continually reading critical carping letters, usually without signature, complaining against the officers, complaining against the War Department, complaining against the Government. This is not the place to present them. There is nothing to show here they have been presented to the War Department or to Secretary Baker. I submit they ought to have a chance. I believe they stir up distrust, occasion loss of patriotism, and it does the boys they seek to help absolute harm. If I did not think so, I would not take the time of the House to say it. Everyone is proud of our soldiers. Everyone wants to help them. No one knowingly wants to harm them. I do not charge anyone knowingly does that, but I fear the effect will be bad. I can not believe they desire it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not. I am in favor of bringing the Army back from the other side just as quick as we can get them back in an orderly way. It took a good many months to get them over there, moving them as fast as we could, and it naturally will take a good many months to get them back, moving as fast as we can. Secretary Baker has sent letters saying that not a single opportunity is missed to bring them back as fast as they can.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is not true.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Iowa says that is not true. He may be right, but I can not believe that the Secretary of War, a Cabinet officer, the man charged with this responsibility, the man who must know something about the situation—I can not believe that he would write a falsehood to this House, and if he did somebody ought to institute impeachment proceedings against him.

Gentlemen over there on that side may smile and laugh, but you are making history to-day. Four million boys went into the war to fight and are returning to be assimilated into society. Are you going to bring them back contented, happy men, full of patriotism and pride for the part they took and the service they have rendered, or are you going to instill in them hatred, distrust, doubt, and fear as to some of the hardships they endured? It does not do us good to teach our boys to hate and despise our own Government. It does positive harm. I prefer to believe they are proud of their Government, proud of their fight; and while I do not know what is in their minds I feel sure that is true as to most of them.

Now, one word further. We are told that the boys slept in water. We are told that the boys did not have two undershirts. I have no doubt that in certain instances this is true. Out of 4,000,000 men inducted into the Army almost overnight, if there was not waste, if there was not abuse, if there were not even almost outrages, it would be the marvel of the hour. Just a few minutes ago the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] moved to strike out a \$4,000,000 item and insert \$2,000,000, and it was agreed to here with great complaisance. That may be a proper amendment; I do not know; but what I do say is that I listened attentively and no one gave any good reason for it.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. No; my time is short. We have invested \$500,000,000 in cantonments. I have no doubt that a great deal was wasted, but the people at that time at the beginning of the war wanted the cantonments built and built quickly, and you could not stop to dicker with a man whether you would pay him \$2.40 or \$2.60 a day. They wanted us to move forward. We did move forward. We made mistakes. We doubtless made waste by the haste, but what I do say is that we have \$500,000,000 invested in cantonments, and they strike out \$2,000,000 which is provided for the upkeep without rhyme or

reason. The same gentlemen that are to-day breaking and smashing up this bill, moving to strike out two and three million dollars in one item, cutting it in two in every item—these same gentlemen will probably be here at the next session explaining that we let the property go to waste; that we let \$500,000,000 be invested in cantonments go to wreck and ruin, and it will be said that we are to blame and not the gentlemen who moved to strike out the items. I feel sure history will record that the American Army, both at home and in France, was the best paid, best fed, best clothed, and best cared for army of any of the allied armies. It will show that no army of the past wars has been so well cared for. I know there will, out of 4,000,000 men, be exceptions, but I insist the rule will prove my statement true. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield until I make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 25 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what is the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has moved to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HASTINGS. Unless these 25 minutes are to be devoted to a discussion of the paragraph I shall object.

Mr. DENT. Then I move that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman can not do that. The gentleman from Alabama was recognized to prefer a request for unanimous consent. But he can not take the gentleman from Massachusetts off the floor to make a motion. The gentleman from Massachusetts was recognized and has the floor for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Is not a point of order reserved on the paragraph?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. DENT. Then I shall make the motion at the conclusion of the five minutes to be used by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for five minutes in opposition.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the following communications:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
LOCAL UNION, No. 161, OF GREENFIELD, MASS.,
Greenfield, Mass., February 13, 1919.

Hon. ALLEN TREADWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some time ago communications were sent to Postmaster General Burleson from the New England Council of Telephone Workers, of Boston, an organization of which this local is a member, and as yet we have received no reply.

We, the members of this local, take the liberty to ask you as our Representative in the House to do all in your power to help us in this matter of adjusting this condition and reestablishing the relations and dealings that we enjoyed with our employers prior to Government control.

This is not a condition that affects our local only, but it is the situation throughout New England, affecting not less than 15,000 employees, and which, if not remedied in the near future, may cause serious curtailment to the wire system.

Thanking you in advance for the help which we know you will give us in this matter, we beg to remain,

Truly, yours,

[Telegram.]

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., February 14, 1919.

Hon. ALLEN TREADWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington:

Springfield Telephone Operators' Union, Local 3A, extending over western Massachusetts, whose membership are your constituents, respectfully direct your attention to the unreasonable and indefensible position of Postmaster General Burleson in refusing to permit company to make negotiation with employees on question of wages and conditions; has failed to establish any machinery to take place of former satisfactory relations of employees with company committee appointed by him to investigate and report on wages and conditions; ineffective and insincere. Our representative compelled to resign. Request you institute congressional investigation of Federal Administration of Wires.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I beg to say that I rose before the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, I bobbed up ahead of the gentleman three or four times.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no purpose to discriminate as between gentlemen at all, but the Chair thinks the gentleman from Kansas was just as alert as the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to striking out this paragraph. I think some of it is necessary to the Army. You have to treat soldiers right in order to keep up their patriotism, I hear. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] seems very fearful that we will destroy the patriotism of these fighting soldiers if we draw attention to the fact that they only have one shirt, when they ought to have two. The American soldier does not pull his patriotism on or off with his shirt. The gentleman concedes that there is only one shirt very often when there should be two. We do not want to make a fuss about this, but there is no reason why we should not insist that he have the other shirt or anything else that is needed. No one's patriotism is going to be destroyed by getting him a square deal. I do not know about the gentleman's—although he seems to be very touchy on the subject—but he need not worry about the rest of us or about the Army. It is not going to hurt this Army to have the injustice that is in it corrected. On the contrary, it will help its patriotism.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps the gentleman does not recall that the only man on the floor of the House so far who comes to the defense of the administration is the chairman of the Democratic congressional committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. He does that officially, not personally.

Mr. LITTLE. I had not thought of that, because politics was the farthest thing from my mind. This is not a criticism of the department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman from Kansas acquit the gentleman from Oklahoma of having induced the President to write that letter, saying his faith was in the Democratic Members and not in the Members upon this side of the House?

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, yes; I got him to do that myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is mistaken. Whatever possible political feeling there may be here and there, I am satisfied that these criticisms to which he is objecting are not criticisms of the department. They are criticism of the military caste which dominates the department. Yesterday we put through an amendment to take out of the hands of the military the right to final disposition of the applications for discharge, and to put them in the hands of the Secretary of War, which was a compliment to the department, I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma. This is a contest, not between us and the department, but between us and the irresponsibles, the men in the Army who have no sense of responsibility, and these criticisms are just and proper and timely. If they can not be made now, in the name of God when would they be made?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it not a fact that the Acting Judge Advocate General joined in the criticism of these sentences?

Mr. LITTLE. He has made the very best argument against some of them.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And if Members of Congress are to be criticized for making them, so should the Judge Advocate General.

Mr. LITTLE. Conditions went so far that Members of Congress ceased to have the rights of ordinary citizens. A Member of Congress was told that if he butted in on anybody's application for a discharge the boy would suffer, and the time has come when the Congress on both sides should learn some self-respect, when it should make these irresponsibles responsible, so that an ordinary citizen who goes out to fight for his country gets a square deal when he gets through. They should be allowed decent consideration. If one of them is sent by court-martial to the penitentiary for 20 years because he chewed gum, the men who sit on that court-martial ought to be put out of the Army. The gentleman from Oklahoma is mistaken in his reasons for resenting this criticism. I do not believe the gentleman from Oklahoma has any disposition to support these irresponsibles in their wrong decisions, but that is what it amounts to.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, the gentleman is in error about that. The gentleman is an Army man.

Mr. LITTLE. No; I am a Congressman.

Mr. FERRIS. But he has had experience in the Army, and he knows that the same system prevailed when he was in the Army as prevails now.

Mr. LITTLE. Not around where I was; and I was president of a good many courts-martial.

Mr. FERRIS. Every speech that I have heard to-day has had in it some sort of criticism. About eight years ago, when I first came—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have another minute. I want to ask him a question.

Mr. LITTLE. And I want another minute to answer him.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask that the gentleman may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. I have some personal testimony I want to offer. About 8 or 10 years ago, out at Fort Sill, Okla., immediately adjoining my home town, a green country boy came down from Kansas and enlisted in the Army. The boy made a remark about an officer's wife. I never knew whether the remark was true or not, and I do not know now. They tried that boy by the same court-martial proceedings then that prevail now, and gave this green boy 20 years in the penitentiary. The Congressman from western Kansas, Judge Reeder, whom the older Members will remember, and I spent two or three years trying to get that boy out, and we never could. I want to say this: This system is an octopus; well, it is worse than that. It has been with us a long time—by far too long a time. I merely wanted the House to know this method is not new. It is not a product of this administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LITTLE. I want a minute to answer the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LITTLE. Let me answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With the understanding I am to have five minutes?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama about his intention for this evening.

Mr. DENT. My intention is to run just as long as the House will allow me to do. I would like to finish this bill if possible.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can easily inform the House. It is a matter of convenience to inform the House whether he proposes to move to rise at 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock or whether he intends to try to keep the House in session until 10 o'clock.

Mr. DENT. I intend to try to keep the House in session as long as possible up to 10 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will state to the gentleman that we have had lots of debate on this paragraph, but not a word on the paragraph. Now, I really have something I want to inquire about in reference to the paragraph and one or two slight observations to make.

Mr. DENT. What time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Five minutes, and it is probable not that much.

Mr. DENT. I will make it 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall terminate at the expiration of 12 minutes. Will the gentleman indicate who is to have that time?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from Iowa to have five minutes, the gentleman from Minnesota five minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall terminate at the expiration of 12 minutes' time, to be consumed as indicated. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] seemed to suggest that I was probably a little inconsistent, because the rules were the same in 1898 as now. I wish to disprove it. I never heard during the Spanish-Philippine War any court-martial sentence that compared in severity with hundreds of these. These fellows have simply gone crazy in a riot of arrogance. Now, another thing. I was president of many courts-martial, and we never found tyranny essential to secure respect. The finding of a court-martial must be approved or disapproved by the commander. We had a boy that was arrested for a minor matter, and technically he really possibly could have been sent to the penitentiary. We had 11 Volunteers and 2 West Pointers on the court, and we voted 11 to 2 to give the boy 60 days in the guardhouse and a fine of \$25.

The sentence of the court-martial was sent back disapproved by the general, and he said that if the boy was guilty at all he ought to be sent to the penitentiary and bobtailed, and if he was not guilty we should have acquitted him. Now, what did we do? I moved to reaffirm the sentence, which we did, 11 to 2, and it was sent back to the general. Now, all he could do was to disapprove it and turn the boy loose with no sentence. He had already been in the guardhouse anyhow for 60 days, which was punishment enough anyway. There is no sense in pulling a man around by a ring in his nose. My idea in every court-martial was that you should use a little common sense and equity. The rigid features of the regulations are only intended for the battle front anyway. Nobody fit to command men would enforce them strictly at home. That is the proposition involved and that was my theory then, as it is now. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as I have not occupied five minutes upon this bill, I presume I was not one of those that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] referred to, but I want to say this right at the outset, the chairman of the national Democratic congressional committee may take the view which he seems to advocate, that this Congress ought to be indifferent to the just complaints of the American soldier, but that is not the position of the Republican side of the House, and, so far as I know, not the position of anybody on the Democratic side except the gentleman himself. [Applause.] I would be ashamed of myself and ashamed of Congress if it turned a deaf ear to the appeals of soldiers and their dependents.

To whom have these men to come to make complaints if not to us? Where are they going to get a hearing? What attention has the War Department or the administration paid to them? None whatever. Every man in this House knows it. Are we to sit here like graven images when our soldiers are mistreated, when outrages are perpetrated upon them, and not lift our voices even in protest? I would go further than any man has offered so far, unless it be, perhaps, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], who proposed yesterday to take away the salaries of some of these officers. This Congress ought to be asserting its dignity, its rights, and its determination to protect the American soldier against the impositions that have been put upon him by some of these high officers and some officers not so high.

I do not find so much fault with these lieutenants as some do. Most of them are splendid young men. Where do these orders come from? They come from above. They come because the heads of the departments sanction them and are willing that these conditions should go on. When you get down to the cause, the responsibility rests upon the Secretary of War and the administration, who could stop these abuses by a word.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. You voted to draft these men into the military service for the period of this war?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did, for the period of the emergency. And your department is not discharging them as they ought to be, in accordance with the terms of that bill.

Mr. GORDON. This Congress has no right to discharge them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is entirely in error. A moment's reflection will convince him of it. The War Department could discharge them now—is discharging some of them, in fact. Congress could provide for their immediate discharge, but every move in that direction is blocked by the administration. I voted to enlist them for the period of the emergency. If the emergency is not over, when, in heaven's name, will it be over? Not during my lifetime.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not yield further to the gentleman. I have only five minutes, and I hesitated about taking that.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party has always been in favor of caring for the defenders of the country, and the Republican Party will continue to maintain that position, notwithstanding the strictures of the gentleman from Oklahoma and other prominent leaders on the Democratic side. It will always find us desirous, not only of preserving the rights of the enlisted man, but of giving him that care and attention which his sacrifices deserve. Now that the war is over we want him returned to his home and his job, instead of holding him in camp to minister to the vanity of some high officer or gratify the ambition of some one who wants to pose as the dictator of the affairs of the whole world.

I have been only led to speak these words—I have not occupied any other time on this bill—because the gentleman

from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] persisted in reading a lecture to those who took the part of the private soldier in the discussion here upon this bill. He intimated that this side was just simply trying to raise trouble. We are trying to protect these men. We have not the power in our hands now to do anything more than protest. If we could we would do more, and we will do more than protest if these grievances are not remedied when we obtain control of the House. This condition of affairs can not be endured, but the only remedy we have now is to agitate and agitate, until the country fully understands the situation, and the Members on this side ought to continue to do it. It has brought forth much good already. Everyone knows that there has been an altogether different spirit on the part of the War Department about discharging the men than there was two months ago. Two months ago you could not get a complaint heard anywhere. Now the orders are changed and there are places where you get hearings. Before you could not get a man discharged, no matter what the case of his dependents or the sufferings that were inflicted upon his family. Since that time the War Department has modified its orders as a result of the agitation that has been started here and the complaints that have been made on this floor. It ought to and I think it will modify them further. It has finally got around so as to admit in some extreme cases that men on the other side of the ocean will be discharged. I want to see it get around so that it will bring every man home as fast as possible. The gentleman from Oklahoma says: "I do not know anything about these vessels coming home partly filled." If he does not know it, he ought to know it. It has been stated here on the positive knowledge of gentlemen who have come home on them. They are only coming at the rate of 50,000 a month. It will take over two years from now to get the boys back at that rate.

I do not wish to take further time of the committee on this subject. But if the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks he is going to stop discussion on this subject he has another guess coming. He is making one of the greatest mistakes he ever made. He will hear more of it in this House until the grievances are remedied and his party will hear more of it in the future than it wants to hear. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the attention of the committee to the paragraph under consideration, especially to this language:

The acquisition of title to building sites, and such additions to existing military reservations as may be necessary.

And I would like to ask of the gentleman in charge of the bill whether that is in here simply because it is the language carried in similar bills, or whether it is contemplated to make practical application of it?

Mr. DENT. It is language that has been carried in the bills heretofore.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. One further inquiry. Here is language, "Rentals for the United States troops in China." Can the gentleman state what rentals are referred to and how much they amount to in a year?

Mr. DENT. The amount in the estimate is \$50,000.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That leaves a total of \$200,000. How does that compare with the amount heretofore carried in bills of this kind?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say to the gentleman I think it is the same amount. And they had under consideration, at least a proposition was made to the committee, that we should appropriate money to build permanent quarters there in China, rather than to keep up this item of annual rental, but the committee has never thought it wise to take action upon it as yet.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the House, I want to make an observation that to me is of considerable interest and importance.

We have heretofore felt that it was necessary to maintain in the Philippine Islands a military establishment of considerable size. I was quite surprised to learn that during the closing days of the Spanish régime in the Philippine Islands the Spanish troops there numbered no more than 2,000. We have for a great many years maintained in the islands a force of 12,000 men. A few years ago, beginning about a year before this present administration came into power, the American troops in the Philippine Islands began to be concentrated, to be withdrawn from outlying Provinces, some of them commonly known as "wild" Provinces. That reduced the number of American soldiers necessary to do the military work of the islands. Their places were taken by native troops, either scouts or constabulary, and the number of native troops, scouts or constabulary, was not increased.

When this great war came on it was necessary to further reduce our Military Establishment in the Philippines, and I want to bring to you the information, which is interesting to me and I think it will be to you, that the American military force in the Philippine Islands has now been reduced to a point—perhaps I am not justified in giving the exact figures, but very much less than half of anything that we have heretofore thought was necessary—and it is apparent that in the immediate future the entire military force of the United States in the Philippine Islands can be, and should be, reduced to a number only sufficient to man the fortifications at Corregidor, and not enough even for that purpose, for native troops in large measure can be utilized for that purpose. Personally I can see no reason why there should be maintained in the Philippine Islands a military force greater than 2,000 from now on.

This is the result of an extraordinarily happy situation which the years have produced in the islands. The American flag was raised in the Philippine Islands at a time of strife. Its raising was the signal for an insurrection. That insurrection was put down by the military power of the United States. For a time the inhabitants of the islands felt that our mission was not that of friends, one not to help them but to make use of them. In the years that have passed the islanders have learned that the mission of America there is the same as the mission of America everywhere in the world—that wherever the flag flies, in its shadow only democracy and freedom shall live. [Applause.]

To-day if anyone should go to the Philippine Islands and undertake to start an insurrection against the United States he would be mobbed and slaughtered by the Filipinos themselves. The great bulwark of our strength in the islands does not come from our military forces that we send there, but from the loyalty and affection and patriotism of the people of the islands. The Moro problem has ceased to exist. The head-hunter has ceased his fight, and all are becoming amalgamated into a great, great people. To me it is a tremendously successful piece of work. The credit for it does not belong to any particular individual nor to any particular time. It is a gradual and a perfect evolution. This, of course, has no application to the political future of the islands. It has no bearing upon the shaping of the political future of the islands; but it does indicate to me, and I trust it will to you, that the people there have developed a public consciousness, have developed a personal and national self-respect, have developed an affection for the ideals of the American Government, and they are now willing to trust their future to the conscience and the heart of the American Nation, knowing that if the time shall come when political independence should be given to them, they know America will deal justly with them and ever be their friend. It is pleasing to contemplate the best of feeling now exists between the Filipinos and ourselves, and that never again will the hand of war be raised in the Philippines against the American flag. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ROADS, WALKS, WHARVES, AND DRAINAGE.

For the construction and repair by the Quartermaster Corps of roads, walks, and wharves; for the pay of employees; for the disposal of drainage; for dredging channels; and for care and improvement of grounds at military posts and stations, \$3,000,000.

Mr. FREAR and Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. I move to strike out the figures "\$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$500,000." That is in line 24, on page 37.

Mr. BUTLER. What was the amount carried in this item prior to the war?

Mr. FREAR. I will tell you if you will wait a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FREAR: Line 24, page 37, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$500,000."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to a lecture by the chairman of the Democratic congressional committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], and he is the only one,

I am glad to say, who has expressed himself in that way, and those of us who have listened to that lecture and understand how baseless were his charges against this side of the House and also that side of the House, which protested last night equally strong, will understand why his efforts were so weak during the last election, as shown by the political results. It came about through those same methods, which were not successful then, and which will not be successful at this time. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has said, Members will protest, and we have the right to protest here, against the unfair and unjust treatment of these soldiers, and if the gentleman from Oklahoma is honest and sincere in his belief, as he says here, and realizes that there are hardships and wrongs to be righted, let him introduce a resolution of investigation and introduce it before this House adjourns, so that we may be able to get legislation which will remedy the situation.

He may be able to get an investigation, which the average Member can not. That is what will test his sincerity at this time. The chairman of the Democratic National Committee criticized the fact that we had just reduced a \$4,000,000 item to \$2,000,000, and he said we did it without any evidence whatsoever. We did have evidence that \$4,000,000 was ten times as much as had been appropriated for this same item just before the war, and we reduced it to five times as much as it was then, and there was no word from the committee to say that that would not be sufficient for their purposes.

Now, turning to this item, the bill carries seventeen times as much for the item as it did before the war. It was \$165,000 prior to the war. Now it is \$3,000,000 in this bill. We do not blame the committee for it. The committee did not receive these estimates until the middle of January. The members of the committee are not to blame. They give the best efforts they can, but it is our duty to act in these matters, to inquire about them, and I have suggested three times as much as was given before the war for this very purpose. What does it include? Why, it includes, according to the item, dredging channels. Do we have to dredge any more channels now than we did before the war?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] criticizes our complaints at this time. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] stated to-day to us that the week prior to Christmas the War Department demobilized 194,000 men. Last week the department demobilized 30,000 men. They demobilized six times as many in the week before Christmas as last week. If 194,000 men could be demobilized in the week before Christmas, can we not have better results now? Why do they not demobilize faster now? That is what we are asking. That is the complaint that is made. Why could the department be able to demobilize 194,000 men immediately after the armistice and only 30,000 men last week?

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get back to the bill, I would not for a moment suggest that this item of \$3,000,000 be reduced if I did not believe, as I stated, that we have gone mad on the subject of these expenditures. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], who stands for his party and who stands here for a bill ten times as large as the bill passed before the war, ought to be willing, with us and with his colleagues, who stood with us on this floor last night, to try to get a bill of reasonable proportions. That is what we are doing; what we are trying to do. I think that is a fair statement. I trust it is. The gentleman from Oklahoma has not been here during the discussion and he has not offered anything. Unless the committee has something to offer to show that this item should amount to \$3,000,000, I believe we ought not to grant that amount, and I believe we granted the correct amount in the last item, when we put it at \$2,000,000, instead of \$4,000,000, as contained in the bill. We allowed five times as much as the item in the last bill before the war and acted on as good judgment as could be secured from the committee.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Have you read the testimony on this item?

Mr. FREAR. Has the gentleman anything to offer in regard to this?

Mr. GORDON. I have, yes; and if you have not read the testimony what do you know about it?

Mr. FREAR. I have not read it, but I will say this: That I have appealed to gentlemen whose judgment is as good as that of the gentleman from Ohio, including the chairman of the committee, who says many of these items come in as complete guesses. I am not accepting such testimony blindly. I will not accept testimony unless I know who gives it, and unless I know that those who give it are fair, conservative, and unprejudiced. Who are the men? We have had the question here previously.

Mr. GORDON. If you have not read the testimony, you do not know.

Mr. FREAR. We have had bills before us previously where officers of the War Department have asked money for dredging purposes all over this country—from Dan to Beersheba—and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon] has voted with me against some of those bills. These gentlemen ask appropriations for dredging purposes. In some instances that may be justified, but when we ask the committee for information we are entitled to it from the committee.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman moved to reduce the item for barracks and quarters from \$4,000,000 to \$2,000,000, and the House, in my judgment, erred in voting for that amendment. We have over \$500,000,000 invested in barracks and quarters for the care of the soldiers, and the percentage of money which we have allowed for the care of these barracks and quarters—\$2,000,000—is, of course, wholly inadequate. Now the gentleman asks to have this item which we are now considering reduced from \$3,000,000 to \$500,000.

Gen. Marshall, who is the representative of the War Department charged with the conduct of these affairs, in making this estimate, comes before the committee and asks for \$6,464,199. He divides it into different items: For road construction, \$1,407,621; for repair of roads, \$2,100,000; for construction of walks, \$166,665; for repair of walks, \$305,217; for construction of wharves, \$632,675; for repair of wharves, \$864,000. It is true that in the bill we passed for 1917, the last bill passed before the war, we voted \$600,000 for this item.

Mr. FREAR. One hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. In the last appropriation prior to the war, \$600,000.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman knows that the Government has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in these particular branches of military activity, and that we have this property that we did not have before the war. In the matter of the repair of roads the gentleman ought to know that the operations of the Government have damaged the roads on military reservations and fields in a way that they must be repaired.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it proposed to take any part of this money to repair what we understand to be public highways?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No; but to repair Government roads, military roads, roads to the cantonments; and the gentleman knows that we have many miles of those roads that have been torn up and worn out.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to vote for an appropriation to repair public highways that have been damaged by the operations of the War Department.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. How much of this \$3,000,000 is estimated to be necessary for construction work?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The committee has not allowed any of the money for construction work. Gen. Marshall asked a certain small amount for construction, but the committee did not deem that there was any new construction needed.

Mr. GOOD. The paragraph uses the word "construction," so that any part of the appropriation could be used for construction. I agree with what the gentleman has said about repair. You have got to keep up your buildings and your roads; but all of this might be used for new construction.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is true; but I think the gentleman will agree with me that we have got to allow some discretion and some judgment to the War Department. This applies not only to those cantonments that have been erected but to all of these different activities scattered all through the country; and I think the gentleman will admit that there might be some place where some small construction might be required.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Might I ask the gentleman if any part of this appropriation will go for the repair of roads which the Government activities have broken down throughout the country?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Not for public roads, only for Government-owned roads.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that the words "for the pay of employees" are preceded and followed by a semicolon. Does that mean for the pay of any employees in the Quarter-

master Corps or for the employees engaged in the work mentioned in this paragraph?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think it is for the employees engaged in the work mentioned in this paragraph.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That language ought to be in there, for otherwise it would allow them to pay any employees. Why not put it in "for the pay of employees engaged in work under this paragraph"?

Mr. MANN. That is the construction of this language by the War Department.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It ought not to be with this punctuation. I move, Mr. Chairman, to amend—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman's word is always good for anything with me. The gentleman suggested that a considerable amount of this appropriation would go for fixing roads which have been hardly used in the war.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The money would be confined to the improvement of roads on military reservations, on Government-owned land.

Mr. LITTLE. I got that; but the impression I got from the gentleman's former statement was that it was largely to be expended on the roads injured within the reservation, and I do not find that in the Book of Estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska and other gentlemen about the necessity of sufficient appropriation to care for the property which we have at the military posts and stations; but somewhere and sometime we have got to commence to practice economy. Here is an appropriation wholly unrelated to the war. It has nothing to do either with the war or demobilization of the troops.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. After I have made an intelligent statement I will permit the gentleman to interrupt me. Of course, the number of camps, posts, and stations are increased and their force is increased. But it is proposed now, on a routine matter, to increase the appropriation 500 per cent over what it was before the war.

Mr. FREAR. Seventeen times—\$165,000 before the war and \$3,000,000 now.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It depends on how far you go back. In 1917, the last appropriation before the war, the chairman of the committee says it was then \$600,000.

Mr. MANN. My statement was absolutely correct. Now it is proposed to increase it 500 per cent. It does seem to me that we might properly cut these items somewhat, because if we are ever going to get back to the point where we can pay our expenses out of the taxes we raise, and not out of the money we borrow, we have got to get down below an increase of 500 per cent over the expenses of 1917. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. How does the gentleman arrive at the conclusion that the acquirement of these roads and the enormous increase in the mileage of the roads resulting from the use of the military equipment is not the result of the war?

Mr. MANN. I did not, and nobody except the gentleman from Ohio, who has a wild imagination at times, thinks that I said anything of the sort. Nobody has said that acquirement of these posts and institutions was not connected with the war. The maintenance has nothing to do with the war. Their maintenance next year will be the same as it will be 10 years from now, so far as the war is concerned. Unless we abandon the posts and institutions there will be more roads two years from now than there will be one year from now. It is simply a routine matter to care for the property which we have, and the amount of care depends on the appropriation. The property ought to be fairly well cared for. There is not a man here who does not know that the roads and wharves and the care of the grounds at military posts and stations can be fairly well done and at half the cost proposed in this bill. It may be that they want so much money to spend to beautify some of these grounds. I am very fond of flowers, and very fond of beautiful beds of fancy flowers at military posts and stations, but after all there is a limit as to the expense we ought to incur for even such a noble purpose as the planting of flowers. We have got to commence to economize, and this side of the House will have to do it

in the next Congress if that side will not do it in this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I think the motion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] should not prevail. The reason I think that may be briefly stated in this form: We have constructed 32 camps and cantonments since the war started, at a total cost of about \$300,000,000. We have built in addition 23 flying fields, which are in the nature of camps. We had already permanent Army establishments which had cost over \$200,000,000 when the war started. The substance of these figures, therefore, is that the Nation has an expenditure in properties of over \$500,000,000. Each and every one of these 50 or 60 sites, scattered throughout the whole country, has its exits. Unless roadways are built they could not have been used during the war, and unless roadways are reasonably kept up, then the entrance is impossible for any purpose in the future. It may be said with less particularity that the other items embraced in this particular item, for which \$3,000,000 are authorized, are of equal importance. No house which you build is worth while unless you keep the roof on, so as to keep the elements out, and no property is worth having or maintaining even for future use unless you provide exits to it. Three million dollars is a large sum of money, but when you consider 50 or 60 Government properties, camps, cantonments, and Army sites, and aviation fields, all of which we are in duty bound to preserve until we can dispose of them, or further use them, and consider that for two years the rains and the snows and the heat and the cold have made their inroads, it is but natural to find holes in the ground in the roadways of all of them, and they make it difficult for Army trucks to get in and out of those Government properties. If you do not provide some reasonable, moderate, and yet sufficient amount for their upkeep it means the abandonment of all except the permanent Army posts as spots isolated, and not at all as in the nature of going concerns.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGLE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas if it is his interpretation of this paragraph that this money can be expended outside of the reservations? He has spoken of exits and approaches. Does he understand this can be extended outside the reservation owned by the Government?

Mr. EAGLE. If my friend means to ask me if I think any portion of the \$3,000,000 can be expended upon roads not connected with camps, cantonments, or Army sites, I answer him unhesitatingly, "no." If he means the approaches to the camps, cantonments, and Army sites, and yet outside of the immediate reservation thereof, I answer him, "yes."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], and at the risk of seeming inconsistent I desire to direct the attention of the committee to the fact that during the war in constructing new activities upon the part of the Ordnance Department and the Quartermaster Department of the Army, such as proving grounds, fortifications, arsenals, and other war activities, large tracts of land have been acquired, and within those reservations many miles of roads have been constructed, and in many of the reservations the roads were made of a permanent character, of cement or concrete. The approaches to the reservations are public highways within the towns or counties, and they have suffered very much by reason of the increased traffic made necessary to get the materials to the ground where this construction work was being carried on.

I know of one case, so informed by the officers of the War Department, and I think I have seen it within not many miles from the District of Columbia, where part of the funds heretofore appropriated for this department have been used for constructing roads outside the reservation which had been acquired, and I know at least from statements made and information acquired that in the State of Texas money was expended for roads connecting with the roads within the reservation. I have in mind an instance where a proving ground was acquired within a summer-resort town, where tremendous activities were conducted in connection with the construction of the buildings and the laying out of the roads within the reservation. Tractors were used to haul materials from the railroad freight yards, where a side track was installed and where heavy trucks were used, and many guns were hauled over the roads within that town, and the roads within the town and in the immediate vicinity of the reservation were completely ruined. That little town, under the system of government obtaining in the State in which it is located, will be put to an expense of from \$20,000 to \$40,000 to repair those roads. The employees came from the outside, and they live in buildings on the reservation, and instead of being a benefit to the town, whose only source of revenue and support is from summer visitors, that activity is going to prove

a detriment to it from now on. Yet the Government has declined to contribute any share of the expense of repairing those roads in the immediate vicinity of the approach of the reservation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman's position; but does he contend that under this paragraph a part of the money might be used to do that?

Mr. WALSH. No. This paragraph is practically the same as was in the bill last year, but money has been expended for that very purpose in other sections of the country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That might be justified in war times, because they had to get the material over the roads.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes; but does the gentleman think it is just, after the war activity has ceased, for this Government, after having ruined roads by immense traffic, which was not contemplated at the time the roads were constructed, to now walk away and leave those roads in that condition? The tax rate in this little summer colony is already very heavy, as heavy as it can bear. The Government ought to repair those roads and put them in the condition they were in before they were ruined.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the Government ought to remedy the defects it has caused, but I do not think it ought to be done in an Army appropriation bill.

Mr. WALSH. It was done as a result of the appropriation carried in the Army bill, and we are carrying an appropriation now for roads within the reservation, and I know of an instance down here at Arlington, where they expended money outside of the reservation to build concrete roads of a permanent character.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement in regard to the program. It is my intention to continue the reading of the bill, if possible, to final conclusion, at least up to the legislative feature, and I would like to read those, and in the event points of order are made let those points be reserved, but it is not my intention to ask for a vote on the bill to-night.

Mr. MANN. It is not the gentleman's intention, I understand, to proceed to a discussion even of the legislative provisions?

Mr. DENT. No; not even to the discussion of them, but I would like to have them read, and if any points of order are going to be made I thought those points of order should be reserved, and then I will not ask for a vote to-night.

Mr. MANN. The points of order can be made and not reserved unless the gentleman desires them reserved. If points of order were made somebody might offer an amendment at that place. I have no desire—

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman propose to have a Sunday session to-morrow morning, running past midnight?

Mr. DENT. Oh, no; I hope really to go on and get through.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope so, but the gentleman has served notice that he expects to have the bill completed to-night, and with the progress we are making that will be about time for the memorial exercises to-morrow morning, which begin at noon.

Mr. DENT. I hope to finish the reading. The main proposition I wanted to submit to the House is that I will not ask for a vote on the passage of the bill to-night.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If the gentleman will permit, is it his intention to go on with the bill on Monday, or give way to the Calendar for Unanimous Consent?

Mr. DENT. If we can finish the reading of the bill I am going to ask that this bill be in order on Monday.

Mr. MANN. That is a matter of unanimous consent.

Mr. CRAGO. Under that order one could not offer an amendment to-night to any features of the bill.

Mr. DENT. I am perfectly willing to agree amendments may be offered on Monday.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, the request of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DENT. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. DILLON. Five minutes.

Mr. DENT. At the expiration of five minutes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I will say I want to offer an amendment to strike out lines 20 to 25, Quartermaster's Corps, and insert "Secretary of War," believing that it would be best probably and that the Secretary of War would find it better to have this work done by the Engineer Corps or by the Construction Corps instead of by the Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is there an amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There is not, the gentleman from Alabama submitted a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANN. There was an amendment, and I have not heard it voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama took the floor and asked for unanimous consent and then engaged in this informal conversation with other Members.

Mr. MANN. Let us vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DENT. I have made it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand it. The gentleman started to make one and then went into a discussion with Members and the Chair did not catch what it was.

Mr. DENT. I thought I made it, that at the expiration of five minutes all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be concluded.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman allow me two minutes?

Mr. DENT. At the expiration of seven minutes.

Mr. DILLON. Am I to have any time?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is to have five minutes and the gentleman from Missouri two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of seven minutes—

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. DENT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 12 minutes the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of 12 minutes the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall terminate, the time to be divided—five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON], five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], and two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph, as I understand, relates to roads, walks, and wharves. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this money may be expended in Europe, for instance, for the purpose of the building of additional wharves in France or for repair of wharves already constructed in France?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say to the gentleman that in the item for the operation of engineers in the field we were told was carried the fund that would take care of anything of that sort in France. This item is confined entirely to estimates for operation in the United States. There is another item in the bill in which they do provide the money.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, upon that statement, if it is in order, I would move a limitation on this paragraph that no part of these funds hereby appropriated shall be expended in repairs or building projects in France.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. DILLON. To be voted on after the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. MANN. There is an amendment pending, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota first, for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DILLON: Add at the end of line 24, page 37, the following: "No part of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used for construction and repair work in France."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield the floor?

Mr. DILLON. Yes; I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] is recognized.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the vote on the amendments already offered. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON].

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say that the committee accepts that amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER: Page 37, lines 20 and 21, strike out "by the Quartermaster Corps" and insert "as the Secretary of War may determine."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. DYER. I will say to the committee that we have in the Army what is known as a construction corps, which has done excellent work during this war. We also have an Engineering Corps, which probably might be better fitted to do this work than the Quartermaster Corps. And I only offer this, leaving it in the judgment of the Secretary of War to determine which agency, either the ones I have mentioned or any other, he may feel is best fitted to do this. I believe it would be to the advantage of the War Department if we would make the change as I have indicated, and I trust the gentleman will not make the point of order upon that, because it is merely to help the War Department out, and not in any way to embarrass them, that I have offered the amendment.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Missouri, but I will state that the Quartermaster Department is now, by the concentration provided under the Overman Act, all placed under a general bureau in charge of Gen. Goethals. And I would not like to accept the amendment at this time. I know, if the gentleman will permit, that there is a movement on hand in the War Department to concentrate all of this work in the Bureau of Engineering, but that matter is still a matter for adjustment there, and I think we had better allow this matter to stand as it has stood.

Mr. DYER. That is just the reason I make the suggestion to the committee, because in other portions of this bill there is a provision to repeal certain portions of the Overman Act, and it may be before this Congress is ended we will have repealed the entire Overman Act, and under those conditions it might be an embarrassment to the Secretary of War and he might not be able to go ahead and do some of this important work. And, if the gentleman will permit it to go in without objection, I feel that it is absolutely necessary and important and can not in any way embarrass anybody, because the Secretary of War can have his Quartermaster Corps do it if he, in his judgment, desires to do so. That is my amendment.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I will have to insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DYER. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF HOSPITALS.

For construction and repair of hospitals at military posts already established and occupied, including the extra-duty pay of enlisted men employed on the same, and including also all expenditures for construction and repairs required at the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., and for the construction and repair of general hospitals and expenses incident thereto, and for additions needed to meet the requirements of increased garrisons, and for temporary hospitals in standing camps and cantonments; for the alteration of permanent buildings at posts for use as hospitals, construction and repairs of temporary hospital buildings at permanent posts, construction and repair of temporary general hospitals, rental or purchase of grounds, and rental and alteration of buildings for use for hospital purposes in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for use during the existing emergency, including necessary temporary quarters for hospital personnel, outbuildings, heating and laundry apparatus, plumbing, water and sewers, and electric work, cooking apparatus, and roads and walks for the same, \$7,500,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] state what is included within the language in lines 16 and 17, "for use during the existing emergency"? Does that mean the period of the war?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes. That is the language that has been used, as the gentleman knows, throughout the act.

Mr. WALSH. Of course these hospitals will have to be used after the war is terminated, will they not?

Mr. GORDON. The hospitals will have to be used until the men get well. That is a part of the emergency.

Mr. WALSH. I will say, in reply to that pertinent suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, made in an undertone, that the language "existing emergency," as carried in the legislation passed heretofore, has uniformly referred to the war. It seems that that is the interpretation to be placed upon that phraseology now. The use to be made of these hospitals would terminate when the war terminated?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I certainly will.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman realizes that out here at Walter Reed Hospital an emergency exists now in which they

must have sufficient space to take care of those wounded soldiers who have returned, and they will possibly have to build some buildings that will not be permanent, but are of that character that can be used until a great lot of these soldiers can get out of the hospital.

Mr. WALSH. Well, the gentleman from Illinois is aware of the fact that we have passed a measure providing for a number of hospitals to take care of these soldiers coming back.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is true; but those that we provided for in that legislation were for the use of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, under the Treasury Department, for the soldiers who were discharged. Now, these soldiers that have lost limbs—an arm or a leg—must be taken care of, and that hospital is very much crowded; and so an emergency does exist there, and possibly in some of these other hospitals.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman is wholly mistaken, I think. Although he is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary—and I speak with great diffidence—he is evidently mistaken as to the construction of the word "emergency." The word "emergency" was substituted for the term "end of the war" for the precise reason that it is used in this paragraph here. The word "emergency" and the words "ratification of the peace treaty" are not synonymous in any of this legislation.

Mr. WALSH. Well, "the gentleman from Massachusetts" did not say that. I said that in other legislation which has been enacted, war legislation—

Mr. GORDON. Yes—

Mr. WALSH. The phraseology "existing emergency" has been uniformly interpreted to mean during the continuance of the war.

Mr. GORDON. No; you are mistaken about that.

Mr. WALSH. Perhaps I am, but I do not think so.

Mr. GORDON. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman is mistaken in thinking that I am mistaken.

Mr. GORDON. That may be the gentleman's construction.

Mr. WALSH. I was simply asking the gentleman from Nebraska if this language here, as used in this paragraph, was to be interpreted as meaning that those hospitals were to be used during the continuance of the war.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No; I will say to the gentleman I am quite sure that the construction would be "for use during the emergency for these hospitals, growing out of the war."

Mr. WALSH. Then what is the existing emergency, that they have got to rent and purchase grounds in the District of Columbia and elsewhere?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Well, I am informed by the gentleman in charge of the Medical Department that, owing to the fact that we are getting so many wounded and sick men home, our hospital facilities are being enlarged in every direction, not only in this city but elsewhere, and buildings are being rented for one purpose and another, and the emergency requires this additional appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and offer an amendment in line 7, to strike out the letters "Ark" and insert the word "Arkansas."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I accept that amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 38, line 7, strike out "Ark" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Arkansas."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreement to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SHOOTING GALLERIES AND RANGES.

For shelter, grounds, shooting galleries, ranges for small-arms target practice, machine-gun practice, field-artillery practice, repairs, and expenses incident thereto, including flour for paste for marking targets, hire of employees, such ranges and galleries to be open as far as practicable to the National Guard and organized rifle clubs under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, \$300,000.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that down to line 8 that is a paragraph? It is, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DYER. I want to ask the chairman of the committee why insert in line 6 the words "to be open as far as practicable

to the National Guard and organized rifle clubs"? Is that necessary? We have had a great deal of discussion, as the gentleman knows, about the situation in regard to the National Guard in the service and Regular Army men, of which I know little, but I do know something. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] gave us a good deal of information along that line. Would it be necessary to include that? And if we did include it, would it enable Army officers to prohibit the National Guard officers from using the ranges practically at all?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No. I will say to the gentleman that the explanation of that language employed by the committee was that it was necessary to use the language "as far as practicable" and "prescribed by the Secretary of War," because the hours of practice and the time of the use of these shooting grounds had to be arranged so that they would not conflict with one another.

There is no discrimination between the National Guard and the Regular Army in the matter of the use of these ranges.

Mr. KAHN. The national defense act also provides that the rifle ranges shall be used by these various organizations.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And the language "as far as practicable" not only refers to the National Guard, but also, as the gentleman from Missouri will observe, to organized rifle clubs. Not only do they have to permit the regular military organization, but also in order to encourage rifle practice to permit as far as practicable civic organizations to use these grounds.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to do anything or to offer any proposition that will interfere with the regulations; but I do offer an amendment, on page 39, line 6, which I am sure does not interfere with the regulations. That is, to strike out the words "as far as practicable." It will still be under the regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER: Page 39, line 6, strike out the words "as far as practicable."

Mr. DYER. That will not interfere with the regulations and will not encourage Army officers or anyone to deny to these organizations the use of these rifle ranges.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. Suppose two organizations wanted to use these rifle ranges at the same time. Unless you leave the matter in the discretion of the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations on the subject—

Mr. DYER. He can do that.

Mr. GORDON. If you leave out the words "as far as practicable," if the two organizations wanted to use it at the same time, you would have a conflict, would you not?

Mr. DYER. I do not think so. It would still be under the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War. He will make the regulations, and he will provide through the proper officers, wherever a rifle range is located, so that the National Guard can use it, the time when they may use it, and the time when the rifle clubs may use it and when they may not. It will not interfere with the regulations at all, I am sure. I think the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] will agree with me in that respect.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That language has always been carried in the item.

Mr. DYER. And there has been more or less trouble sometimes. There is a great deal of feeling that ought not to exist between the Army and the National Guard, and we have heard it creeping out here on the floor. I hope we may do everything we can here to make that friction as little as possible. If we leave out those words, the Secretary of War can still make regulations, and not lead to the belief on the part of the National Guard officers and the rifle clubs that they can not use the range unless they go down on their knees to the Regular Army officers.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does not the gentleman believe that if we strike out that provision we will open up the possibility of the very contest that he seeks to avoid, that both organizations will say at the same time that they are entitled to the use of a particular rifle range?

Mr. DYER. No.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I understand that the gentleman still leaves it under regulations, but I am fearful that the gentleman will not get what he is seeking. As I understand the experience of the past, the Regular Army and the National Guard have had no trouble so far as the use of these rifle ranges

in these contests is concerned, and I think it will be well to let the language stand as it is.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALEXANDER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER]. The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO AND LOSS OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

For payment of claims for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, operation, or maintenance of the Army that have accrued, or may hereafter accrue, from time to time, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That settlement of such claims shall be made by the Auditor for the War Department, upon the approval and recommendation of the Secretary of War, where the amount of damages has been ascertained by the War Department, and payment thereof will be accepted by the owners of the property in full satisfaction of such damages, \$40,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Are these claims for which settlement is authorized for damages to property in this country or abroad?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. In this country, principally small damages because of artillery fire or any other damage resulting from the operation of our Army. Prior to the war we carried an appropriation of \$5,000 in that item, but owing to the tremendous activities of our military forces in the past year the report to us is that they will need more money, and so we put in \$40,000. It is to cover small damages occasioned by the activities of the artillery, for instance.

Mr. WALSH. They only had \$30,000.

Mr. TILSON. This appropriation was begun about the time we began to hold maneuvers throughout the country, where there were a number of small damages that could be settled immediately at a far less expense and with a great deal more satisfaction than if they permitted them to go on and become claims later. It was found to be very advantageous to do that, and since that time it has been carried in the bill for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman says that the settlement was made by the Judge Advocate?

Mr. TILSON. No; a representative of the Judge Advocate General's Department was at the maneuvers and he was along to attend to this particular kind of business and adjust it.

Mr. WALSH. He has no authority under this paragraph; this settlement is made by the Auditor of the War Department.

Mr. TILSON. Certainly; the settlement must come up to the auditor.

Mr. KAHN. The Judge Advocate General or his representative is at the camp where the damage is done. He is the legal officer of the War Department and investigates the claims, their nature and incidents connected with it, and finally when it comes to an agreement with the claimant as to the amount of money to be paid it is certified to the Auditor of the War Department.

Mr. TILSON. I know from experience that it has worked well, having been in the field with troops and being more or less acquainted with claims for damages.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Connecticut state why it is desired to have this made immediately available? Have they used up the appropriation for the last year?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know whether that has all been used up or not, but it might well be. If it is used up it ought to be made immediately available.

Mr. KAHN. For instance, they have large-gun target practice. The great concussion causes the breaking of a large number of windows in residences near the fortifications. The War Department receives these claims and ought to be in a position to pay the claimants.

Mr. WALSH. They had better establish a glass factory. [Laughter.]

Mr. KAHN. I know that not long ago an orphan asylum located near where one of these big guns was emplaced had all the windows shattered and through this kind of legislation they were able to have them replaced.

Mr. WALSH. What method follows if they can not make a settlement?

Mr. KAHN. They have to come to Congress. A bill for a claim is introduced in the House and it goes to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think I am right in remembering that this item went into the bill because of some maneuvers that were held in Kentucky a number of years ago, where the troops marched over fields across growing crops and did a great many other things causing minor damages, which, in the aggregate, did not amount to very much and in individual cases probably did not amount to enough to justify the man who was injured in hiring an attorney, preparing a bill, and hanging

around Congress for the next 100 years. Congress at that time thought that in cases of that sort the damage ought not to be inflicted without making such reparation, and there was a provision inserted in the bill authorizing the settlement.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. As a matter of fact, would not a point of order lie that the committee had no jurisdiction of it and it belongs to the Committee on War Claims?

Mr. MANN. The provision is legislation, but a point of order would not lie against it, because it is too late to make that point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. I do not think it is.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, for fear that this will go to the Committee on War Claims, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this belongs to the Committee on War Claims. I want to find out about it.

Mr. MANN. Let me say to the gentleman from Kansas that after this bill is reported in the House in this way, it is too late to make the point of order that the provision in the bill is a legislative provision and ought to be referred to the Committee on War Claims. It is not possible for this to be referred to the Committee on War Claims, and the point of order of the gentleman is that it should have been referred. It is too late to do that.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take issue with the best parliamentarian in the House upon that subject, but I want to say that I have looked up this very line of subject somewhat, and while, of course, I have not been able to give the matter the broad attention and extended consideration which the gentleman from Illinois has, and shall not challenge his suggestion, because I am satisfied he is sure he is right, as he probably is, yet I do not believe that this committee has any jurisdiction or right or authority to bring any such provision as this in this bill. I do not say that simply because it is legislation, but I would like to know what the Committee on Military Affairs has to do with a matter like this, which the rules say shall go to the Committee on War Claims. These big committees go poking their noses into everybody's business in this House. I do not say this ungraciously, because the criticism is not made personally as to this committee, but there is not a little committee in this House that comes in here that does not find, about every third day, some big committee tramping all over it. It would be very much better for this House if every little committee was a working committee and did something, and if you big fellows did not have so blamed much to do we would get better bills from you.

Mr. GARNER. How many bills has the War Claims Committee passed in this Congress?

Mr. LITTLE. I will tell the gentleman one thing about that. There is not a committee in this House that has a bigger stack of stuff than the Committee on War Claims or that is apparently more busy in its committee room than this committee, and there is no small committee that has as many clerks, I think, as they have. The gentleman has been here longer than I have, and if they have not done anything will the gentleman tell me what they are doing with so many clerks?

Mr. GARNER. I am merely suggesting to the gentleman that in case this provision does not go in this bill there is no chance of its being reported by the War Claims Committee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman claim that the War Claims Committee would have jurisdiction to report out a provision such as this?

Mr. LITTLE. They would certainly have jurisdiction to handle any claim of that nature.

Mr. WALSH. There is no claim in this provision.

Mr. LITTLE. What business has it here, then?

Mr. KAHN. The very purpose of this provision is to prevent a lot of claims of \$1.50 or \$2—

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, I know it is a good, sensible thing to do, but done according to the rule there should have been a bill from the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. KAHN. Being introduced into this House and turned over to some committee.

Mr. LITTLE. I realize that.

Mr. KAHN. The idea of the paragraph being that those very small amounts can be settled by the War Department without any trouble.

Mr. LITTLE. It is all right, and I am not making the fatal point of order that I could make for that reason, but what I am calling attention to is the fact that these big committees just usurp authority right and left.

Mr. GORDON. Of course, I understand the gentleman's grievance. He is on the Committee on Claims, but this would not go to the Committee on War Claims; it would go to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LITTLE. That is all right, and if it did it would be in good hands, and it would have been far better if it had gone there.

Mr. GORDON. There never would have been any relief then. The whole matter has been fully explained by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. LITTLE. I think you are both right, and for that reason I am not going to make the point that I could, that it is legislation, but I wish that these big committees would attend to their own business and let the little committees take up their work. The enforcement of that rule would improve the congressional work 25 per cent.

Mr. GORDON. We will accept the gentleman's apologies.

Mr. LITTLE. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENT OF BUILDINGS, QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for military purposes during the fiscal year 1920, \$100,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. Will the chairman of the committee inform the House for what purpose the \$100,000 is to be used in the rental of buildings in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Nebraska to answer that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the War Department asked us for \$226,000 and we granted them only \$100,000. The items are asked for quarters for officers and for noncommissioned officers and for privates.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the need of providing rental for any private office building for quartering officers of the Army when we have provided the most modern office buildings in Potomac Park for the use of the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. KAHN. This is for the rental largely of warehouses in the District of Columbia where the military stores have to be stored and taken care of. A very small part of it, as I recall, is used for office rentals.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there anything in the hearings which relates to this subject, so that we can have positive information as to what this item is to be used for?

Mr. FOSTER. Let me say to the gentleman there is one over here north of the depot that is used for medical supplies—quite a large warehouse.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was formerly used by the Post Office Department for the manufacture of post-office bags and equipment.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it is back of where they ran that spur track in.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the item may be passed over temporarily until I can examine the Book of Estimates to obtain the information which I am seeking from the committee.

Mr. DENT. I think we can give the gentleman the information.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman has the information, I withdraw the request.

Mr. DENT. On page 22 of the hearings the gentleman will find it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to pass this over without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McKEOWN offers the following as a new paragraph: After the period at the end of line 7, page 40, insert the following:

"That no part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be available if the War Department shall permit any officer to make orders, rules, or regulations prohibiting officers or enlisted men from communicating information of conditions in the Army to United States Senators or Members of the House of Representatives."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is whether the amendment is in order. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not care to be heard on the point of order. If the gentleman wants to make the point of order, let him make it. I will make the point of no quorum.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order; and let us dispose of the point of order.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be rereported; I was reading something here.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. DENT. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order? This is a limitation upon this appropriation bill and I do not think it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is no question it is in the form of a limitation, but it is further true that it infringes upon the authority now vested in the executive officers of the Government. They have authority now to provide regulations under existing law. There is nothing more fundamental in the legislative precedents in the House than that if a limitation, though negative in form, is actually affirmative, so that it interferes with the discretion of an executive officer, or with any authority which the executive officer under existing law now has, it is legislation in fact, and thereby comes under the inhibition that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment as offered does not require any executive branch of the Government nor anybody in the Army to do any positive thing. If it directed the War Department to do something which it was not authorized now to do, it would be legislation no matter what the form might be, but this is a mere withholding of the money appropriated if certain conditions exist. We have a right to prescribe the conditions so long as it does not direct the executive department to do something it is not now authorized to do.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the very point—whether it does not interfere with some authority that the executive officer now has.

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly we may make an appropriation direct to an officer, and he may expend it as he pleases if we stop there under the law, but we can put a direction at the end of that that it shall not be spent in a certain way. That does not direct him how he shall spend it. That limits his authority as to how he shall spend it without a direction to him, changing the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes in which to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think this amendment ought to be put on this appropriation bill. You receive letters, and so do I, and at the end of the letter you will find this statement:

Do not let my name be used; do not let them know I wrote you. If you do, it means the penitentiary for me.

I say it is time that this Congress went on record or took some action to protect the men who can not protect themselves and who can not be heard except through the Congressmen who represent their districts. Gag rule is un-American. We put the soldiers in the service and put them there by law. This Congress passed a law that took them whether they wanted to go or not. You can not hear from them and get the facts from them, because they are afraid they will be jerked before a court-martial. You have already seen and heard the record as to what takes place in a court-martial proceeding under the present methods. Every soldier and every officer in the Army of the United States ought to have the right to go to his Congressman or his Senator and tell him the conditions without fear of being brought up before any board and dealt with. And I hope that this amendment will carry. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the gentleman from Wisconsin the information the committee has on this subject to which he was referring.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have obtained that information by reading the hearings of the committee, and I withdraw the reservation of the point of order to line 7, page 40.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

For the employment of the necessary civilian instructors in the most important trades, for the purchase of carpenter's, machinist's, mason's, electrician's, and such other tools and equipment as may be required, including machines used in connection with the trades, for the purchase of material and other supplies necessary for instruction and training purposes, and the construction of such buildings needed for vocational training in agriculture for shops, storage, and shelter of machinery as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 27 of the act approved June 3, 1916, authorizing, in addition to the military training of soldiers while in the active service, means for securing an opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations, part of this instruction to consist of vocational education either in agriculture or the mechanic arts, \$10,500.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, while the first part of the paragraph apparently undertakes to provide for certain things which it says are necessary for instruction, and so forth, and needed for vocational training, under the provisions of section 27 of the act of June 3, 1916, that is a mere matter of opinion, and the balance of the paragraph is a construction or interpretation of the law, and hence itself is legislation.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I certainly will.

Mr. KAHN. The purpose of that language is this: There are certain branches of the service that have to have mechanics to do the work. For instance, the Aviation Section has to have ground mechanics. The department found it very difficult to get the number of men that was required to do the work, and therefore they organized vocational schools to train these men in those specialized lines of endeavor. I understand the Motor Transport Section had to do the same thing, and they have been conducting those schools under this provision of law.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am in entire sympathy with the idea of giving the maimed soldiers vocational training. But there is no use in getting up and making a lot of sympathetic pleas about the vocational training provided for in this bill or in this paragraph. The total amount of it is \$10,500. It covers a great variety of subjects, and no one knows what it will be spent for. But I dare say that no one will receive vocational training out of it. It will be spent for buildings or something of that sort, in order to ask some more money. Now, there is a vocational training scheme provided for. I do not think there is any justification for the item as it appears in the bill. As far as the amount is concerned, I am not worried about that at all. Ten thousand five hundred dollars in a bill of nearly a billion and a quarter does not scare me, and I have no objection to spending \$10,500 or \$100,000 or even \$500,000 if necessary, added to it, to teach these men vocational training. But this item will not do it.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman object to the entire paragraph?

Mr. MANN. I have made a point of order on the paragraph; yes.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], who is a member of the committee, developed the fact that they are teaching soldiers in his section of the country in agriculture. They are training men in farm labor, and the money in part is being spent for them.

Mr. MANN. Well, now, of course, that is a pretty theory, and it may be all right. At camps or barracks they may teach a one-legged man how to do some work on a farm, but, after all, a one-legged man on a farm can do enough work to more than pay for his keep, and so can a one-armed man.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. In the act of 1917 we appropriated \$250,000 for this same item; in the act of 1918, \$55,000; and now they come and ask only for \$10,500.

Mr. MANN. That is sufficient illustration to show that it is useless.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

RIFLE RANGES FOR CIVILIAN INSTRUCTION.

To establish and maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges for the use of all able-bodied males capable of bearing arms, under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of War; for the employment of labor in connection with the establishment of outdoor and indoor rifle ranges, including labor in operating targets; for the employment of instructors, for clerical services; for badges and other insignia; for the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice; for the purchase of materials, supplies, and services, and for

expenses incidental to instruction of citizens of the United States in marksmanship, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and remain available until expended, \$10,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the language "and to remain available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order upon the language indicated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words, in line 17, page 41, "and to remain available until expended."

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman can not make a motion like that.

Mr. DENT. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been made to the entire paragraph. What does the gentleman say on the point of order?

Mr. DENT. What is the point of order?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That it is not authorized by existing law. It is legislation, and all that kind of thing.

Mr. DENT. It is authorized under the national-defense act.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Alabama say that there is an act to authorize the Secretary of War to maintain indoor and outdoor rifle ranges for the use of all able-bodied males, and so forth, thereby justifying the Secretary of War in establishing these things anywhere he may please and as many of them as he may please?

Mr. DENT. There is no question in the world but that it is authorized under the national-defense act. The gentleman states it is not authorized by law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If we ever passed that kind of a provision, authorizing the Secretary of War to go over the country and establish such things, I do not know of it.

The CHAIRMAN. When a point of order is made to a provision it is incumbent upon the chairman of the committee to furnish the authority.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a number of members of the committee have discovered things this year that they never thought of before. I will read section 113 of the national-defense act:

The Secretary of War shall annually submit to Congress recommendations and estimates for the establishment and maintenance of indoor and outdoor rifle ranges, under such a comprehensive plan as will ultimately result in providing adequate facilities for rifle practice in all sections of the country. And that all ranges so established, and all ranges which may have already been constructed, in whole or in part, with funds provided by Congress shall be open for use by those in any branch of the military or naval service of the United States and by all able-bodied males capable of bearing arms, under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the controlling authorities and approved by the Secretary of War. That the President may detail capable officers and noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army and National Guard to duty at such ranges as instructors for the purpose of training the citizenry in the use of the military arm. Where rifle ranges shall have been so established and instructors assigned to duty thereat, the Secretary of War shall be authorized to provide for the issue of a reasonable number of standard military rifles and such quantities of ammunition as may be available for use in conducting such rifle practice.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] makes his point of order it is sound, and it should go out. So far as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is concerned, it seems to me his point of order is not well taken at all, because it is provided for by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, so far as the point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, if that is good the whole paragraph will go out on the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TILSON. The part of the paragraph that makes it immediately available, I suppose, should go out on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order to the whole paragraph. If the language cited by the gentleman from Connecticut is subject to a point of order, then the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan to the entire paragraph is good. It is a familiar principle in our parliamentary procedure that if any part of a paragraph is out of order a point of order directed to the entire paragraph must be sustained.

Mr. TILSON. I was perfectly aware of that fact, and I was trying to call attention to the fact that if that part were removed it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman from Alabama can offer his amendment taking that out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is seeking to point out that the gentleman from Michigan has directed a point of order to the entire paragraph, and if there is an appending item in the paragraph the point of order applies to the whole paragraph. Hence nothing remains in that case for the Chair but to sus-

tain the point of order of the gentleman from Michigan. Of course, it will then be competent for the chairman of the committee to offer the paragraph with the offending matter stricken out as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. DENT. Then I understand the Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Michigan?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to restore the language beginning on line 4, of page 41, down to line 18, ending with the word "war," and restoring the amount. That is in effect the paragraph with the words "and to remain available until expended" stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Restore the paragraph beginning with line 3 down to and including the words "Secretary of War," in line 17, and adding the words "10,000."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I make the point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama. The gentleman has referred to section 113 of the national-defense act, which provides for establishing and maintaining indoor and outdoor rifle ranges, which is much broader than I thought it was, but at that it does not justify such legislation as is contained in the latter part of the amendment—

For the employment of instructors, for clerical services; for badges and other insignia; for the transportation of employees, instructors, and civilians to engage in practice; for the purchase of materials, supplies, and services, and for expenses incidental to instruction of citizens of the United States in marksmanship.

It seems to me such expenditures as that are not justified under section 113.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. How would you maintain a rifle range that really was a rifle range without operating targets and hiring the labor for doing it and for the various other things which are incidental to shooting at a target on a range?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Here is language which would justify the paying of the expenses of transporting civilians engaged in rifle practice. If one in Boston took it into his head to go to San Francisco and practice at a range there, and the Secretary of War took it into his head to spend the money to transport that man, he could use the money under this provision. If there is any such authority as that carried in the original act in section 113, I do not read it aright.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The act authorizing the Secretary of War to establish civilian rifle ranges carries with it the presumption of the right to regulate the use of them, to prescribe who shall use them, and how and under what circumstances, and inasmuch as there is no attempt in the act originally to limit his authority in this respect, the House has sought to limit the extent of the exercise of that authority by the amount of the appropriation which it gives him to do anything with, and that is \$10,000. He is not likely to send many men across the continent to practice at rifle ranges on \$10,000. If he does, he will not have much left for anybody to practice anywhere else.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. This gives him authority to transport men. The amendment is subject to the point of order. The gentleman says there is no presumption that the Secretary of War will do anything of this kind. That is a rather violent presumption. He has done so many things, he has used money in so many ways that Congress had no idea it would be used, I do not know that it is a violent assumption that he will send men clear across the country if he takes it into his head to do it.

This is much broader in other respects than those I have pointed out than the act itself. The idea of giving the Secretary of War blanket authority to spend public money as he pleases is a mistake. We have had examples enough of the misuse of money so that we ought to be careful in drafting these laws. Why, there was a paragraph here a few pages back carrying \$449,000,000, and the Secretary of War might have used it all buying ships without any previous authority of law. He might have used the whole \$449,000,000 in buying automobiles for officers in the Army. There was no limit. He could use all the money or a part of it for any of the many purposes stated in that section. They say we must trust the Secretary of War. Well, I would not say a word reflecting on the Secretary. I should not have employed some of the words used here earlier in the day—some very harsh language used toward the Secretary of War. When I am inclined to criticize him, I prefer to adopt the parliamentary language used by the gentleman from California, and to say that he is "optimistic." I believe in restrict-

ing, just as much as we can, the use of money by the Secretary of War.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, we ought to have the point of order discussed, or else go ahead with the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let the Chair rule.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the Chair rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Michigan to be discussing the point of order. He was undertaking to point out that the language of the amendment was broader than was justified by the language of section 113 of the national-defense act.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that has anything to do with the \$449,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; of course not. The Chair does not mean that the gentleman in every utterance he made was speaking to his point of order, but in a general way he was, and the Chair did not propose to break in on his argument. Of course, the only thing before the committee is the point of order. The Chair will ask the gentleman to discuss his point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have discussed it; and I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this section as now offered by the gentleman from Alabama is much broader than section 113 of the national-defense act. It authorizes the Secretary of War to use money for purposes not mentioned in section 113. There are many things that are not mentioned in section 113 at all.

Mr. DYER. What does the gentleman refer to that the previous legislation does not authorize?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The Chair has the amendment before him.

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman will yield, he has the national-defense act there which authorizes the establishment and maintenance of outdoor rifle ranges, and so forth. The only thing this does in addition is to explain more in detail what the Secretary of War can do through the national board for the promotion of rifle practice on these ranges. I am sure the gentleman will not find anything in the language that is not necessary to conduct a rifle range.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will permit me to call attention to section 113 of the national-defense act, which reads as follows, "Under reasonable regulations, to be prescribed by the controlling authorities and approved by the Secretary of War," is not that language sufficient to admit the detail for expenditures that is set out in this paragraph of the appropriation bill "under the reasonable regulations"? That is certainly indefinite as to detail, but is restricted within the usual intention of the English language as to extent and character of detail.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Some things mentioned in the section are clearly within the provisions of section 113, and some of them, in my judgment, are not included and can not reasonably be included. For instance, transport and instruction of employees and civilians engaged in target practice.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is the gentleman opposed to the appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think if the work is properly carried on it is all right.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman permit me to say that officers returning from the front told me that one reason why we made such splendid progress over there was due to the fact that Americans had been taught how to shoot. This provision, which is authorized by the national-defense act, provides facilities to our citizens to learn how to shoot. You have to have instructors; you have to have all of these various facilities, if you want to carry out the provisions of that law. Therefore it seems to me that there has to be a little latitude in the language of the paragraph. No doubt every separate item is covered by regulations issued by the Secretary of War. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the provision of the national-defense act on which this provision in the bill is based:

Sec. 113. Encouragement of rifle practice.—The Secretary of War shall annually submit to Congress recommendations and estimates for the establishment and maintenance of indoor and outdoor rifle ranges, under such a comprehensive plan as will ultimately result in providing adequate facilities for rifle practice in all sections of the country. And that all ranges so established and all ranges which may have already been constructed, in whole or in part, with funds provided by Congress shall be open for use by those in any branch of the military or naval service of the United States and by all able bodied males capable of bearing arms, under reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the controlling authorities and approved by the Secretary of War. That the President may detail capable officers and noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army and National Guard to duty at such ranges as instructors for the purpose of training the citizenry in the use of the military arm. Where rifle ranges shall have been so established and in-

structors assigned to duty thereat, the Secretary of War shall be authorized to provide for the issue of a reasonable number of standard military rifles and such quantities of ammunition as may be available for use in conducting such rifle practice.

The Chair will call the attention of the committee to the fact that the language read is very comprehensive. The point of order raised by the gentleman from Michigan is not without difficulty, but the language cited is so sweeping that the Chair will not undertake to say that the details contained in the appropriation bill are outside the scope of the act, reasonably construed. With some hesitation the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes out of order in order to correct a statement which I made yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] offered the following amendment:

All officers and enlisted men who in actual combat or while in actual service at any front shall have performed the duties of an officer or enlisted man of higher grade or rank shall, for the period during which such duties were performed, and until relieved by competent authority, receive the same pay, and allowance as the officer or enlisted man of the grade or rank whose duties were assumed. Such payment and record of service shall appear on the discharge certificate of each officer and man affected. For pay of such officers and enlisted men, \$2,000,000.

During the debate on that amendment I reminded the House of the historical fact that, at the Battle of Gettysburg, on the third day, after Gen. Hancock and Gen. Gibbon had been wounded and carried from the field, Frank Haskell, of a Wisconsin regiment, seized the command of the troops and with wonderful success acted as general of a division at the very crisis of the battle at the Bloody Angle and the Clump of Trees, and that for this heroic conduct he was commended in Gen. Gibbon's official report. In the RECORD I am reported as saying that Haskell was on that day a lieutenant colonel; but that was an error. I should have said that he was only a first lieutenant—first lieutenant of Company I, Sixth Wisconsin Infantry, acting as adjutant and aid-de-camp to Gen. Gibbon.

For this wonderful service Haskell was made colonel of the Thirty-sixth Wisconsin, and at the head of that regiment, while leading a charge at Cold Harbor, he was killed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the procurement and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, to institutions at which one or more units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are maintained, such public animals, uniforms, equipment, and means of transportation as he may deem necessary, and to forage at the expense of the United States public animals so issued; for transporting said animals and other authorized equipment from place of issue to the several institutions and return of same to place of issue when necessary; for the maintenance of camps for the further practical instruction of the members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from such camps, and to subsist them while traveling to and from such camps and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit; for the payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at such rate, not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as authorized in the act of Congress approved June 3, 1916, \$3,000,000.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Page 42, line 15, after the dollar mark, strike out all of the figures and insert in lieu thereof "100."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, what does that mean?

Mr. DENT. That means that instead of \$3,000,000 it is \$100. I hope that satisfies the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, some days since I read in the RECORD a very caustic criticism by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] of Capt. A. H. Scales, commandant of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station. The criticism was

based upon excerpts alleged to have been taken from an editorial in a publication known as the Bulletin, and also a notice relative to discharges. A personal acquaintance with Capt. Scales led me to the conclusion that the reports reaching the gentleman from Kansas were either erroneous or misunderstood. Accordingly I wrote to Capt. Scales for the facts. I have received a reply from him, which is courteous, dignified, and informing, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. Would not the gentleman be willing to wait until the gentleman from Kansas is present?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There is nothing in the reply that in any way reflects on the gentleman from Kansas, and if there was I would not for a moment make this request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE COMMANDANT,
UNITED STATES NAVAL TRAINING STATION,
GREAT LAKES, ILL., February 5, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. OLIVER: Your letter of January 31 reached me to-day, and I beg to assure you that I appreciate your writing it for it bears the impress of a just man who believes that there are generally two sides to a question. I shall, therefore, take the greatest pleasure in giving you the information you desire, and in telling you that I shall continue to give you all the assistance in my power when you inquire concerning the station under my command.

Before proceeding with the question of the attack made on me in the House by Mr. LITTLE, I desire to mention the matter about which you and Mr. CANNON spoke to me. As we have not the name of the young man concerned, it is now rather difficult to locate the correspondence. I remember distinctly, however, that I took up the matter immediately on my return, and I am under the impression that it concerned a young man not on this immediate station, but at one of the outlying posts. In that case, the correspondence would have been referred to this outlying post, and this might have something to do with matters not going as you desired them. I am taking immediate steps to trace the correspondence, and if I can obtain the name from you, the matter will be very much simplified. I will write you on this subject in a separate communication.

I was filled with amazement on reading Mr. LITTLE's attack on me for a notice published in the Great Lakes Bulletin. He gave it an interpretation entirely foreign to that which I had intended it should bear. Please note that this is a notice and not an order. An order directs men to do certain things, and they are compelled to comply with its provisions. A notice, in this sense, carries to them certain information which it is desirable for them to know. This distinction should be borne in mind in considering this subject. It may be well to state in the beginning that the notice itself was published with my approval. The editorial in the bulletin, to which he takes exception, was published by the editors of the paper, who are enlisted or enrolled men of the Navy, and who, while allowed a great deal of liberty in expressing the opinions of the enlisted men at this station, are, at the same time, governed in their general policy by the commandant's ideas on the proper line to be taken. The editorials, before publication, are submitted to the executive officer of this station, who passes upon their suitability before releasing them.

Speaking in round numbers, there were 40,000 men at this station and in this district when I took command, December 7, 1918. Of this number, the department had authorized the release of 20 per cent. Later on, an additional 20 per cent of the remaining 80 per cent was authorized to be released, making 36 per cent of the whole. This meant that of the 40,000, approximately 14,000 could be released, and the department specified the character of cases that were to receive preferred consideration. This you, of course, know, but the point I am trying to lay stress upon is that after the 14,000 should be released there would remain about 20,000 young men clamoring to be released from active duty.

The volume of the correspondence entailed in connection with this work has been enormous. It has completely overtaxed the capacity of the office force and of all the additional help that we could call in from the other activities of the station. Letters came in not only from Members of Congress but from persons in every conceivable walk of life, and one man's case would sometimes involve scores of letters. About the middle of January, after trying every possible method to decrease the volume of this work, I decided that it was absolutely necessary to in some way decrease the volume of correspondence that was pouring in upon me. This was necessary in order that requests from Members of Congress, as well as other requests deserving consideration, should receive the attention that was their due. Without some diminution of the volume of work it was impossible to give these things their proper attention. I therefore decided that I would attempt to accomplish the purpose by appealing to the good sense of the men themselves, for I have always found that an appeal to the reason of the American sailor and his sense of fair play will accomplish the desired result. I had thought that an appeal of this kind would also work to the benefit of Members of Congress, relieve them of some of their burdens, and consequently relieve me of many of my own.

Had I for a moment suspected that this notice would be a subject for adverse criticism on the floor of the House of Representatives I would have caused it to be worded not only with a view to accomplishing the purpose I have just outlined, but with a view to making it proof against unjust criticism and misinterpretation. Whatever interpretation a Member of Congress may choose to put upon it, it did not mean the things Mr. LITTLE ascribes to it, and it did not mean that there was any objection to any Member of Congress at any time writing a letter to the commandant on any matter upon which he saw fit to address him. It did mean that the men themselves were advised not to bother their Congressmen any more than was positively necessary, and that if they continued to do so they were in a measure defeating the very object which they were endeavoring to attain. Not because it was improper or undesirable for the Congressmen to write to the commandant in their behalf, but because on account of the number of letters and papers of all kinds and descriptions it was

impossible for the office force at my disposal to properly classify, act upon, and answer them.

Your recollection of a statement made by Capt. Laning to the House Naval Committee is entirely in accord with my own recollection of it. Not only that, but I was asked at that time by a Member what I would do in case a Member of Congress made a definite recommendation concerning the release of a man. My reply was to the effect that I would accept that recommendation as to facts and act upon it favorably, provided it came within the scope of my orders. The impression which Mr. LITTLE appears to have concerning my attitude toward the question of letters from Members of Congress is entirely erroneous. I have been glad to receive letters from Members of Congress on this subject, and I am still glad to receive them. I have acted in every case favorably on the recommendation of Members of Congress where I could make the recommendation conform to the orders under which I was acting, the rights of others, and the consideration due the requests for release I received, including those from other Members of Congress. In deciding upon the cases in general, I have received a considerable amount of assistance from these letters from Members of Congress, and I have availed myself of it to the full. The office force under my control has made every effort to answer all communications, particularly those from Members of Congress, with the greatest courtesy. In doing this they have worked long hours, including many hours overtime, each day. If they have failed the failure has been entirely due to the lack of time in which to properly handle all the cases. The records of this office, if examined, will show that an enormous amount of labor and time, all the time that has been available, has been devoted to the endeavor to properly handle all correspondence received, particularly that from Members and Senators. I again express to you the fact that I not only have no objections to receiving letters from a Member, but that I am glad to receive them. They frequently bring to me facts I would not otherwise have known. However, I feel at liberty to state that I believe that Members of Congress are frequently called upon to write letters that they would be just as well satisfied not to write if all the facts were explained to them. In my letters to them I have endeavored to explain all the facts; I have endeavored to write letters they could forward to their constituents, and in this notice which has been the subject of attack I have endeavored to reduce the number of unnecessary applications to them.

Concerning the editorial in the Bulletin which Mr. LITTLE complains of, I will state that this was one of many written in an effort to reduce the state of unrest and dissatisfaction among the station personnel caused by the fact that all could not be released from active duty at one time. The 64 per cent who could not be released are almost unanimous in desiring their releases. For the good of this station I endeavored to appeal to their sense of fairness to their comrades and to the fact, which they themselves well knew, that among them were some who attempted to obtain this release by false pretenses. I advised them that they should carefully consider the validity of their claims before presenting them. I also called the attention of the men to the fact that there were many unemployed in the country and that it was perhaps just as well for them to wait a few months before demanding releases. In short, I combated by every proper method what we here call "release fever," which threatened, and does still threaten, the very object for which the station is here. The editorial complained of, while not written by me nor seen by me until after its publication, was in general line with this policy. Other articles have appeared in the Great Lakes Bulletin, written by chaplains, Young Men's Christian Association secretaries, and others, which had this same object in view and presented arguments along the same line. The strictures that the editorial in question conveyed were intended for and applied only to men who well merited such strictures. Happily these are very few indeed compared with the large body of men attached to this station. I send you a copy of that editorial, and you will see that the extracts quoted by Mr. LITTLE, taken apart from the rest of the editorial, could easily be construed into something entirely at variance with the spirit of the whole editorial. I call your particular attention to a paragraph near the end, which I have marked. There was no attempt in this editorial to insult anybody, and no honest man at Great Lakes was insulted by it. I send you the Great Lakes Bulletin containing the editorial, that you may also see the character of the publication.

We are releasing men at this station at the rate of about 300 a day, and since the order was signed we have released nearly 14,000 at the station alone, not counting those released in the districts under my command. The work has been done as fast as the labor involved could be performed, and has frequently involved long hours overtime. The people engaged in the demobilization, including myself, have not spared themselves whenever the work could be hastened by prolonged efforts. There is a physical limit to the number that can be released each day, and some men, no matter how just their claims, have to wait a considerable time to secure release.

I have written you at this great length because you have written a courteous letter and one I deeply appreciate. I heartily wish that you could have visited this station, that I could have accorded its honors, and I am convinced that you would have left it with a realization that the spirit here is a priceless thing; that it has enabled great things to be accomplished; and that nowhere are officers of our Government, including Members of Congress, more honored and respected or held in higher esteem.

Very respectfully,

A. H. SCALES,
Captain, United States Navy, Commandant.

Hon. WILLIAM B. OLIVER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The notice referred to in the letter is herewith inserted:

DON'T BE A "QUITTER."

Every man of the Naval Reserve Force or of the Regulars, enlisted for the duration of the war, became a party to a contract with the United States Navy and the United States of America when he took the oath and donned the uniform.

This contract was a sacred one—as sacred an agreement as any real American he-made can bind himself to. Every man entering into it pledged himself, on his honor, to serve the Navy of the Stars and Stripes until such time as "finis" has been written to the last chapter of the great war.

That inscription has not been written as yet, nor will it be time to write it until the final decisions of the peace conference are filed away in the archives of the Nations and the last American soldier has been brought back safely from the bloody fields of Europe. Only the climax of the great war, represented by the signing of the armistice, has been passed; ahead of the Navy lies the tremendous job of transporting home

the million or more men it took over, and of rushing food to Europe to prevent hunger and counteract Bolshevism.

What must we think, then, of the man who would "lie down" in the midst of the greatest task ever given any navy, merely because he sees an opportunity for better money "on the outside," or some other equally selfish reason?

Shameful as it is to confess, there are not a few such men at Great Lakes, men who, now that the excitement and glory of the war has passed, think of little else than how they can obtain their releases or discharges; how to desert their conscientious shipmates in the more prosaic, though just as important, work that lies ahead.

These men—and their number would indicate that "discharge fever" has become an epidemic at Great Lakes—have tried nearly every known ruse in deception and intrigue to get out of the service. They have attempted to obtain political influence, they have secured false affidavits as to equally false dependency claims, they have made statements in their applications which proved on investigation to be the most barefaced of lies, and the number of dying grandmothers and other relatives mentioned would indicate to the unsophisticated that nothing short of Persian pox or the bubonic plague is raging throughout the Middle West.

Let there be a misunderstanding, those men who have a truly legitimate reason for wishing to return to civil life as speedily as possible are not included in any category with the would-be "quitters." Men who have dependents and whose circumstances are such that the latter are undergoing actual hardships, are entitled to apply for release or discharge, and to leave the service among the first 20 per cent to go. So are the youths who quit school to enlist, and who now wish to return to complete their education. It is felt that in this particular chapter of the great war these men can be spared, and the justice of placing their applications as the first for consideration is obvious to any fair-minded man.

But the man who has no such reason, nor one equally worthy, and who resorts to lying and subterfuge in an attempt to climb out over the backs of shipmates who have made greater sacrifices than he—such a man is beneath contempt. He is false to his country, his pledged word of honor, and himself.

"God Almighty hates a quitter," and so does the American Navy.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I made a point of order upon the paragraph on vocational training, on page 40 of the bill. I have learned more about it since I made the point of order, and I would like to return to the paragraph and withdraw the point of order, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to page 40, to the paragraph entitled "Vocational training," in order that he may withdraw a point of order heretofore made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order simply for the purpose of asking the gentleman a question. Is there any particular reason why one of the vocations was eliminated from the list carried in the bill? I notice they have dispensed with the purchase of plumbers' tools and equipment.

Have they authorized the giving of any training along that line?

Mr. DENT. I know of no reason why they struck out that particular language. I thought the language was broad enough to include that.

Mr. WALSH. It was carried in the acts heretofore, and I did not know but there was some reason for dispensing with training along that line.

Mr. DENT. No; there is no reason I know of.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, page 41, line 2, by striking out the word "acts" and inserting the word "arts." That is a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

INLAND AND PORT STORAGE FACILITIES.

For inland and port storage, including all necessary buildings, docks, tracks, handling, and other facilities for Government supplies, including rentals and purchase of land, the hire of the necessary employees, \$30,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment and have it read.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order on the paragraph for the purpose of asking whether it is desired to purchase any more land?

Mr. DENT. It is not. If the gentleman from Illinois will allow the amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk to be read, I think it meets any objection which he may have on that line.

Mr. MANN. Let it be read for information.

Mr. DENT. The bill really is not printed as the committee agreed to it. I would like to have the amendment reported for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, strike out all the language after the word "necessary," in line 2, down to and including the word "necessary," in line 5, so that as amended the language will read:

"For inland and port storage, including the necessary employees."

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the amount is to remain the same. Is it intended to purchase any land out of this?

Mr. DENT. It is not, and that is the reason we strike out the language.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but I am not at all sure but the language as reformed would still allow the purchase of land if it was intended.

Mr. DENT. It was expressly stated it was not the intention.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized on the amendment for the purpose of interrogating the chairman. If his amendment should prevail, this whole \$30,000,000 would be for inland and port storage. How is it possible for the War Department to expend that much just on storage?

Mr. DENT. They asked \$60,000,000, and the committee cut it down to \$30,000,000. The gentleman knows this appropriation involves the question of the debarkation of our troops.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why, yes; but they have got warehouses; they have got the storage facilities; and I can not see how it is to be applied except by putting goods in there and taking them out.

Mr. DENT. Gen. Goethals made the statement in reference to the number of warehouses we had in the country at different ports of entry and the different inland warehouses which we had, and that the maintenance would be so much per square foot, and we cut his estimate in two.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then, as I understand, we have got to pay \$30,000,000 every year right along; that we have got to continue this appropriation to keep up our warehouses?

Mr. DENT. No.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman says for maintenance it would be so much per square foot?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit, the greatest item in this appropriation is for the handling of these tremendous stores that we have, and these different departments not only put them in, but many of them have to be handled over and over again as they are taken out, because we have these tremendous amounts of supplies on hand which are almost beyond conception of anybody who has not a vivid imagination. It requires, in spite of the fact it is astounding, and the judgment of those men who had this work in hand and know more about it than anybody else in the United States is that it would take \$60,000,000 to handle it, and the committee cut it in two, not with the idea that it would be taken care of, but that they had to have that money anyway.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Apparently the members of the committee simply know what was the opinion of the general without any facts in support.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. He gave absolute details of every item, as to every storehouse, and the exact amount of the appropriation.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. He called particular attention to the Bush terminals in Brooklyn and the Newark Bay terminals near Harrison, N. J. The quantities of material that are handled through those warehouses alone aggregate in value many hundreds of millions of dollars, and if they are not properly stored and housed the loss to the Government will be enormous.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Nebraska a question. This is one-third, practically, of the entire appropriation made prior to the war; that is, when the appropriations ran about \$100,000,000. There are \$30,000,000 in this one item. I understood the committee took Gen. Goethals's figures and cut them in two. On what basis?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. On the basis that the committee hoped we might get along with less money.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. On that same basis and carrying it a little further, what would be the objection to cutting this \$30,000,000 to \$15,000,000, which would be one-fourth, in the hope that we may get along with that, and we would further reduce the amount of the bill? I am asking for information purely, I am frank to say.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The answer to that is, that we might carry it down to probably a dollar, with the hope that that would be sufficient.

Mr. FREAR. What is the basis of the gentleman's estimate that \$30,000,000 will cover this, instead of \$60,000,000 as estimated by Gen. Goethals?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, in answer to his question, it is the experience and judgment of the members of the Military Committee that in asking for these appropriations sometimes the department asks for rather liberal appropriations. And this being an entirely new

item, and one with which no one has had any experience, our committee thought because this matter has come upon us since this war, with the idea that it would require \$60,000,000 to store and handle the products of the Government during this war, it was something beyond our conception. We finally, after deliberation, made this as our best and most conservative estimate as to what they would possibly get along with.

Mr. FREAR. Let me say that there is no criticism against any member of the committee. They realize that. The one purpose is to ascertain on what basis this \$60,000,000 was reduced to \$30,000,000?

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. The committee felt that as the Army was demobilizing the quantities of supplies and stores that would be required would be materially reduced, and that a much smaller quantity would be handled during the next fiscal year. And on that basis the committee thought probably the director general of the Purchase, Storage and Traffic Division could get along with half the amount he asked.

Mr. FREAR. If it is not all used, the balance will remain in the Treasury?

Mr. KAHN. It will go back into the Treasury.

Mr. FREAR. Of course, we are all in the dark.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to the gentleman, when these great terminals were built the committee was asked for \$53,000,000. It turned out afterwards that the estimate was altogether too small, and it was materially increased. Later about \$50,000,000 of the sums appropriated were covered back into the Treasury. We hope that this amount, on account of the reduction of the Army, will suffice. We may have cut it too much, and it is possible that they will have to come to Congress for a deficiency appropriation. But the committee felt that they were doing fairly by the Government by reducing it one-half.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Are we to understand that this storage is to be in buildings and on property owned now by the Government?

Mr. KAHN. Much of it. And more so in buildings rented by the Government not only on the seaboard, but even in the inland cities.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Would this pay for the rental?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The word "rental" was included in this paragraph before and has been stricken out.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It includes rentals.

Mr. KAHN. Including rentals.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But, on motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], those words go out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It seems to me it would be included anyhow in the word "storage."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It seems to me it might be included, and, following the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], it might include also the purchase of land. Now, if it is intended to pay the rent, if it is intended to give authority to purchase land, I think the words should be there, and direct and positive authority should be given department officials to pay the rent or to purchase the land, and not leave it to an inference, not leave them to use \$30,000,000 without any direction. If the committee knows how it is to be used, let that manner of use be suggested, and let the words be written here, to tell the Secretary what Congress has determined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Gen. Goethals told the committee that about \$4,000,000 of this amount would be required for rentals.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Then would it not be better to leave the word "rentals" in, instead of striking it out? If they had not been there at all, then there would be some justification for Gen. Goethals to use this money for paying rentals; but they are there, or were there, and Congress refuses to permit them to remain. That suggests that the money is not to be used for rentals.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will allow me, I must say his criticism is hypercritical. I have undertaken to change the language so as to make it broad enough to include that, without the right to purchase land. It provides for inland and port storage. I do not think there is any question in the world but that they can take care of it under the language that the committee finally agreed to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does the gentleman say that the language, in his judgment, as he would have it remain, "For inland and port storage, including all necessary storage, \$30,000,000," does not carry authority to purchase land?

Mr. DENT. I certainly do.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The language is so broad and inclusive that I would feel that the authority of the Secretary is without limit; he could use the money in furnishing this storage in any way he might wish.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Let me suggest that the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama has not yet been voted on.

Mr. DENT. Yes; it has not yet been voted on.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And possibly the gentleman from Alabama might be willing to let the words "including rentals" stay. I think the department ought to have authority for that purpose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not objecting to giving the department authority to rent, and I am not objecting now to giving them authority to purchase; but if I wished to give authority to rent, I would say so, and if I wished to give them authority to purchase, I would say so, and I would say so in words that could not be misunderstood.

Mr. DENT. Well, may I ask the gentleman this question: Suppose he used the language he suggests, "For inland and port storage, including all necessary buildings, docks, tracks, handling, and other facilities for Government supplies, including rentals and the hire of the necessary employees," is that what the gentleman wants done?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I was asking the gentleman the meaning of the words, and when he gave his idea of what the words mean I ventured humbly to differ from him. I am not speaking by way of criticism altogether, but I do not like the language, because it seems to me to be too broad.

Mr. DENT. I think the gentleman is speaking by way of hypercriticism, and when he criticizes the language I think he should suggest some improvement upon it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will say this: I have had something to do with drawing appropriation bills, and when I was positively of the opinion that money should not be used for a certain purpose, when I thought it might be, I added words forbidding its use for that purpose.

Mr. DENT. Is the gentleman opposed to the item or has he any suggestion to make as to how the language should be changed? Let us get down to the practical point, unless the gentleman desires to delay the passage of the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The chairman of the committee has no suggestion to make. Is that the idea?

Mr. DENT. I have made a suggestion which I think covers the whole thing, and I have offered an amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why not leave the language in the bill except the "purchase of land"?

Mr. DENT. I am willing to do that.

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest to the gentleman to move to strike out, in line 4, the words "purchase of land."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendment has really never been reported, so that there is nothing to withdraw.

Mr. DENT. I move, Mr. Chairman, to strike out from line 4, page 43, the words "purchase of land."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Page 43, line 4, strike out the words "purchase of land."

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, before I vote for this amendment I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs whether this item includes the storage and handling of the food and clothing for the soldiers over in France?

Mr. DENT. No; only in this country.

Mr. DALLINGER. May I ask the chairman where in the bill there is an item which covers the handling of the food and clothing for the soldiers in France?

Mr. DENT. That is under several different items of the bill. It is under the provision for subsistence; it is under the clothing and camp and garrison equipment. There are several items in the bill that take care of that.

Mr. DALLINGER. I am referring now particularly to the storage and handling of food and clothing for the soldiers in France. The reason I have asked this question is that there is a great deal of complaint from the boys coming home that while apparently there is plenty of food of the very best quality stored over in France the boys do not get it. The boys who have been sick and wounded at a place called St. Aignon, on their way to ports of embarkation, have not been receiving sufficient food fit to eat, and they have not been receiving proper clothing or shelter. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to have enough money appropriated for that purpose, so that the War Department can not say they did not do these things because Congress refused to appropriate the necessary money.

Mr. DENT. I think we have appropriated money enough for that purpose. I hope we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT.

For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hospital supplies, including disinfectants for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships, and transports, for laundry work for enlisted men and Army nurses while patients in a hospital, and supplies required for mosquito destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone, \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may in his discretion select types and makes of motor ambulances for the Army and authorize their purchase without regard to the laws prescribing advertisement for proposals for supplies and materials for the Army; for the purchase of veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; for expenses of medical supply depots; for medical care and treatment not otherwise provided for, including care and subsistence in private hospitals, of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army, of applicants for enlistment, and of prisoners of war and other persons in the military custody or confinement, when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract: *Provided further*, That this shall not apply to officers and enlisted men who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furlough; for the proper care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof, and the payment of reasonable damages not otherwise provided for, for bedding and clothing injured or destroyed in such prevention; for the pay of male and female nurses, not including the Nurse Corps (female), and of cooks, and other civilians employed for the proper care of sick officers and soldiers, under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignment, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War; for the pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men; and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; for the pay of other employees of the Medical Department; for the payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; for supplies for use in teaching the art of cooking to the enlisted force of the Medical Department; for the supply of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; for advertising, printing, binding, laundry, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Is it proposed to purchase any new hospital ships and transports for the Medical Department?

Mr. DENT. No proposition of that kind was suggested.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. As I understand, most of this money will be expended by that division of the Army known as the P. S. & T.—the Division of Purchase, Storage, and Traffic. They are now purchasing the medical supplies for the Army. In all, about \$7,000,000 of this money will be expended for this purpose. The other \$3,000,000, as I recall the testimony, will be expended directly by the Medical Department itself. So far as the committee developed the facts in the hearings, there is not intention to spend any of this money for the purchase of hospital ships.

Mr. MANN. May I ask, in reference to the proviso found at the bottom of page 43, authorizing the purchase of motor ambulances without regard to advertisement, do they need to purchase any more special ambulances?

Mr. KAHN. They are trying to acquire ambulances of special contrivance. As I understand it, they are inducing the manufacturers of ambulances to experiment further in order that the best possible kind of ambulances may be developed. I think the appropriation in that respect would allow the purchase of those ambulances.

Mr. MANN. I can see that this item might be very desirable if it was purposed to get ambulances for use at the front. They would want to make some changes. But these are ambulances purely for use in time of peace to convey soldiers. Is it desirable to let them purchase those ambulances without competition?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think the gentleman from California will recall that one of the medical officers who appeared before the committee made this explanation, but while there is a general plan now to have the different motor vehicles purchased by one central authority, the medical department feel that they are the ones to judge as to the particular fitness of the kind of vehicle they want, and they find that where they do not have that absolutely under their own control they do not get the kind of ambulance they want. Therefore, they ask for that special provision in order to permit them to exercise their judgment as to what they ought to have.

Mr. MANN. Well, now, I take it that when the medical department indicates the kind of an ambulance that it wants the purchasing department purchases that kind of an ambulance. If that is not the case, there is no use in conferring on the Secretary of War discretion to do something else, because all he has got to do is to nod his head and that will be the case. He can require the purchasing department to purchase ambulances such as the medical department desires.

Now that we have returned to a peace basis, is there anything in the act—I do not want to stand in the way if there is—to allow the Secretary of War to buy ambulances without competition just as anybody happens to have a favorite in the motor manufacturing business?

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think that is the intention. The intention rather is to try out new ambulances that have been improved since the last purchases were made. Of course, there are occasions when a soldier falls sick in some little camp where there are no proper hospital facilities. He has to be put into an ambulance and carried sometimes for miles before he is put into the proper hospital.

Mr. MANN. That is the case of private citizens and many more private citizens than there are soldiers. Ambulances are not unknown.

Mr. KAHN. There are some places where there are no civilian ambulances. There are Army posts where they have to depend on the Army ambulance.

Mr. MANN. I am not opposing the Army ambulance. The question is whether the Secretary of War, which means some subordinate official, will be permitted to make a contract with a motor concern for an ambulance at high prices because he happens to have a friend in that concern and to purchase it without competition.

Mr. KAHN. The purpose of the item is to allow the purchase of one ambulance, probably, that has been developed by some manufacturer of ambulances, in order that the Medical Department may have the benefit of new construction and try it out thoroughly. Then, if that ambulance proves a decided success, a larger number could be purchased.

Mr. MANN. The purpose is to experiment with ambulances on the sick and wounded soldier so that people in civil life can have the benefit after the soldier is dead?

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will permit, I recollect that three or four years ago the Surgeon General asked that the same language be inserted for the purpose of standardizing the ambulances, but they never have done it, and they have 57 varieties now.

Mr. MANN. They will not do it as long as some official has a chance to make a contract with some motor manufacturer whom he wants to favor. I am not going to set up my judgment against the judgment of the committee, but I will make a point of order in line 19, page 43, "hospital ships and transports." It is not intended to purchase any of these?

Mr. DENT. I concede the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I will withdraw the general reservation and make a point of order against that language.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think if the gentleman will read that provision a second time he will see that this is for the purchase of medical and hospital supplies for hospitals, hospital ships, and transports.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Vermont is right, and I do not make the point of order.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to take up the time of the committee at this late hour, but I want to call to the attention of the House and the country generally the danger of a possible epidemic being brought over here from the other side in bringing back the soldiers. Typhus is now epidemic in some parts of Europe, in some countries that were engaged in the war. The typhus fever is carried by the body louse. That insect also brings about the so-called trench fever and the so-called relapsing fever. This item carries an appropriation for preventing these epidemics. I feel sure that the Medical Department has a great task before it in trying to stamp out and to prevent any of these diseases being brought to this country. If the Spanish

influenza had been stopped by quarantine at our ports originally we would not have had such a terrible death loss in our country. I understand it is the purpose of the medical officers to see that no typhus, trench, or relapsing fevers shall come into this country.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to line 19, page 43, to the comma after the word "transports." Ought that not to be a semicolon? There is an abrupt change in the text.

Mr. DENT. Yes; and I will offer an amendment to that effect.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Page 43, line 19, after the word "transports," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, that recalls something. We were read a lecture here to-day for making any criticism of the War Department, or of anything that somebody might complain about. We have been read that lecture several times, but here is an illustration of the benefit of calling attention to some of these matters. Some time ago one of the papers here—I think it was the Washington Post—published a story about how the sick boys out at Walter Reed Hospital, boys with one arm or without any arms, were required to do their own laundry work. If that had not been made known, this semicolon would not be required. The semicolon that it is proposed to insert is to be inserted in front of a new item in the bill providing for payment for laundry work for enlisted men and Army nurses while patients in a hospital. I do not apprehend, as a matter of fact, that it was necessary to insert the item in the bill to make the money available for that purpose, but it was necessary probably to put the item in the bill, in order to let the department know that these patients, maimed as they are, unable to do laundry work as they are, still were required to do it or hire it done. I am mighty glad that the Committee on Military Affairs rose to the occasion and provided that hereafter a sick soldier in a hospital shall not be required to get out of bed and hunt for a bathtub or a basin in which to wash his underclothes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that the American negro has proved in the present war that he has a right to share with his white comrades much of the honor that has come to our arms in France. I do this because of the fact that these black troops were raised possibly under adverse conditions, or even unfriendly conditions, and the history of the war in France has demonstrated that they have measured up to the record made by our negro troops in every war in which this country has been engaged from the Revolution down to the Civil War and the Spanish-American War and the war of the present day. [Applause.] I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD some of the official records and citations and facts connected with the operation of these troops.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I inquire as to what the gentleman from Kansas meant when he said that these colored troops were raised under unfriendly conditions?

Mr. ANTHONY. There was a good deal of comment at the time they came into the service, and question was raised as to their possible usefulness.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

Negro soldiers made a record as fighters in this war as they did in the Spanish-American and Civil Wars. Fighting for the first time on the soil of the world's most famous battle fields—Europe—and for the first time brought into direct comparison with the best soldiers of Germany, Great Britain, and France, they showed themselves able to hold their own where the tests of courage, endurance, and aggressiveness were most severe.

Colored troops fought valiantly at Chateau-Thierry, Soissons, on the Vesle, in Champagne, in the Argonne, and in the final attacks in the Metz region. The entire first battalion of the Three hundred and sixty-seventh Infantry—"Buffaloes"—was awarded the *croix de guerre* for heroism in the drive on Metz. Most remarkable of all, they received their baptism of battle in this attack; at the start they won honors which veterans of many conflicts have failed to capture.

In previous engagements of the war, for distinguished service, three colored regiments as units were awarded the *croix de guerre*, which bestows on each member the right to wear the coveted badge. When the fighting stopped the negro troops were nearest the Rhine.

Not until now has the story as a whole of the part played by our negro troops in France been available. The total number of negro combat troops was 42,000. These consisted of the Ninety-second Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Charles G. Ballou, and four regiments of the provisional Ninety-third Division. To describe the colored man as a fighter in a war which, because of the terrible weapons used, called for

more pure nerve than any other war, three ways present themselves: To show the negro in individual exploits, then in a regiment engaged separately with white troops, and, finally, to show him in a battle in a division entirely composed of men of his own race.

NEGRO AS INDIVIDUAL FIGHTER.

Here is an individual exploit:

The Three hundred and sixty-eighth Infantry, colored, fought in the Argonne. It became necessary to send a runner with a message to the left flank of an American firing line. The way was across an open field swept by heavy enemy machine-gun fire.

Volunteers were called for. Pvt. Edward Saunders, of Company I, responded. Before he had gone far a shell cut him down. As he fell he cried to his comrades:

"Some one come and get this message. I am wounded."

Lieut. Robert L. Campbell, of the same company, sprang to the rescue. He dashed across the shell-swept space, picked up the wounded private, and, with the Germans fairly hailing bullets around him, carried his man back to the American lines.

For the valor shown both were cited for the distinguished service cross, and Lieut. Campbell, in addition, was recommended for a captaincy.

Another single detail, taken from this same company:

John Baker, having volunteered, was taking a message through heavy shell fire to another part of his line. A shell struck his hand, tearing away part of it, but the negro, unfaltering, delivered the message.

He was asked why he did not seek aid for his wounds before completing his journey.

"I thought the message might contain information that would save lives," was the answer.

Under the same Lieut. Robert L. Campbell a few colored soldiers armed only with their rifles, trench knives, and hand grenades picked up from shell holes along the way were moving over a road in the Chateau-Thierry sector. Suddenly their course was crossed by the firing of a German machine gun. They tried to locate it by the direction of the bullets, but could not. To their right, a little ahead, lay a space covered with thick underbrush; just back of it was an open field.

Lieut. Campbell, who knew by the direction of the bullets that his party had not been seen by the Germans, ordered one of his men, with a rope which they happened to have, to crawl to the thick underbrush, and tie the rope to several stems of the brush; then to withdraw as far as possible and pull the rope, making the brush shake as though men were crawling through it. The purpose was to draw direct fire from the machine gun, and by watching locate its position.

The ruse worked. Lieut. Campbell then ordered three of his men to steal out and flank the machine gun on one side, while he and two others moved up and flanked it on the other side.

The brush was shaken more violently by the secret rope. The Germans, their eyes focused on the brush, poured a hail of bullets into it. Lieut. Campbell gave the signal. The flanking party dashed up; with their hand grenades they killed four of the boches and captured the remaining three—also the machine gun.

In the larger bodies of colored troops, from the regiment to the division, the participation of the negro soldiers naturally divides itself into two parts on account of the way they were sent over. The negro division, composed of drafted men, did not get into action until right at the last, but individual regiments did. The four regiments that went over first were composed of old National Guard units recruited up to the required quota. These were the Three hundred and sixty-ninth, Three hundred and seventieth, Three hundred and seventy-first, and Three hundred and seventy-second Infantry regiments, afterwards organized into the Provisional Ninety-third Division. Until just before the last days of the fighting, however, they were brigaded separately with French troops. Three of these regiments, the Three hundred and sixty-ninth, the Three hundred and seventy-first, and the Three hundred and seventy-second, have received the high honor of the *croix de guerre* from the French Government for distinguished service. Sixty-one officers and men of the Three hundred and seventieth have been similarly decorated.

FIGHTING BESIDE THE FRENCH.

Here is the fighting record of one of these regiments sandwiched among the French forces—the Three hundred and seventy-second. It was the first to go over. Practically all its line officers, as well as privates, were colored.

They arrived in France on April 14 and went into training with the French on April 28. On June 6 the Three hundred and seventy-second was sent to the trenches just west of Verdun, occupying the famous battle-swept Hill 304 and sections at Four de Paris and Vauquois. On Hill 304 thousands of French and German soldiers had fallen as the battle line swung back and forward, and that this hill was given to the negroes to hold shows that as soldiers they had already won the confidence of the French.

The regiment's first engagement was in the Champagne sector, with Montoir as its objective. Here came the real test; the colored men were eager to get into the fight. They cheered and sang when the announcement came that their chance had arrived—but the question was: Back of their enthusiasm had they the staying qualities drilled into European troops through centuries of training in the science of warfare?

The answer was that some of the heaviest and most effective fighting of the day was done by the negro regiment. From June 6 to September 10 the Three hundred and seventy-second was stationed in the bloody Argonne Forest. On the night of September 25 they were summoned to take part in the Argonne offensive and were in that terrific drive, one of the decisive engagements of the war, from September 26 to October 7. In the nine days' battle the negroes not only proved their fighting qualities in an ordeal such as men have rarely been called upon to face, but these qualities, in deadly striking power and stubborn resistance in crises, stood out with such distinction that the regiment won the coveted *croix de guerre*.

During the battle they aided in capturing 600 prisoners, 15 big guns, 20 minenwerfers, rounded up an enormous amount of engineering material, large supplies of artillery munition, and brought down three German airplanes. For these achievements they were at once cited for bravery and efficiency in the general orders issued by their French commander. The casualty list of the Three hundred and seventy-second in this and the previous fighting carried 500 names of men killed, wounded, and gassed.

Another regiment's record—that of the Three hundred and sixty-ninth, formerly the Fifteenth New York, commanded by Col. William Hayward, ex-public service commissioner—reflects as high a credit on the soldierly

qualities of the negro race. The Three hundred and sixty-ninth was in the Champagne offensive as a part of the Fourth Army, commanded by Gen. Gouraud, a few miles west of the Argonne Forest. These are Col. Hayward's own words describing the drive that tried out his men:

"At 5.25 a. m. the assault was launched, an assault that kept assaulting, so far as our division was concerned, for 12 days, in which we crossed rivers, captured towns, cut and climbed through acres and acres of barbed-wire entanglements, stormed bluffs, ridges, and hills for 14 kilometers, all the way facing stubborn and terribly effective artillery and machine-gun fire.

"When we crossed the Dormois River, where it widened into a swamp, the boche was shelling industriously, and it looked like a hailstorm on the surface of the water. I saw shells break from concussion when they hit the water the same as on the ground. Much of the time we had to lean over and shout into each other's ears to be heard.

"At the end of 12 days we came out with our division, what was left of us, which included 20 officers."

At the very last the Three hundred and sixty-ninth won another distinction. The following is from *The Stars and Stripes*, the organ of the American troops in France:

"The farthest north at 11 o'clock (when the armistice went into effect) on the front of the two armies was held at the extreme American left, up Sedan way, by the troops of the Seventy-seventh Division. The farthest east—the nearest to the Rhine—was held by those negro soldiers who used to make up the old New York Fifteenth, and have long been brigaded with the French. They were in Alsace, and their line ran through Thann and across the railway that leads to Colmar."

HOW NEGRO DIVISION FIGHTS.

Next, to see a negro division in action:

The Ninety-second Division was composed of the One hundred and eighty-third Infantry Brigade, consisting of the Three hundred and sixty-fifth and Three hundred and sixty-sixth Infantry Regiments, and the Three hundred and fiftieth Machine Gun Battalion; the One hundred and eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade, composed of the Three hundred and sixty-seventh and Three hundred and sixty-eighth Infantry Regiments and the Three hundred and fifty-first Machine Gun Battalion; the One hundred and sixth-seventh Artillery Brigade, consisting of the Three hundred and forty-ninth, the Three hundred and fiftieth, and the Three hundred and fifty-first Artillery Regiments, and the Three hundred and forty-ninth Machine Gun Battalion, the Three hundred and seventeenth Trench Mortar Battalion, the Three hundred and seventeenth Engineer Regiment, the Three hundred and seventeenth Engineer Train, the Three hundred and seventeenth Ammunition Train, the Three hundred and seventeenth Supply Train, the Three hundred and seventeenth Train Headquarters, the Ninety-second Military Police Company; the Three hundred and seventeenth Sanitary Train, comprising the Three hundred and sixty-fifth, the Three hundred and sixty-sixth, the Three hundred and sixty-seventh, the Three hundred and sixty-eighth Field and Hospital and Ambulance Companies, 600 of the officers of the division were negroes.

Soon after the Ninety-second was thoroughly organized it took over the Marbache sector. Here their activity in trench raids on the Germans earned from the Germans the name of "Black Devils." By these raids they drove the Germans north beyond Erhaupt and Voivrotte to Cheminot Bridge. In the hope of putting a check on these attacks the boches tried to destroy the bridge and flooded the country.

Up to this time the Ninety-second had never been in a battle. The only regiment in it that had seen a big engagement was the Three hundred and sixty-eighth Infantry, which took part in the action in the Argonne forest. The division's chance came in the drive on Metz. They were notified at 4 o'clock Sunday morning, November 10. The motto, "See it through," of the "Buffaloes," the Three hundred and sixty-seventh Infantry, trained at Camp Upton, echoed through the whole division.

They began their advance at 7 o'clock from Pont-a-Mousson. Before them was a valley commanded by the heavy guns of Metz and by nests of German machine guns. The negroes seemed to realize that here for the first time was the great opportunity to show their mettle—that for the first time they were going to battle as a division. A sense of race solidarity possessed them, uniting their purpose as no amount of drilling could, and they were literally a terrible foe as they plunged forward to Preny. So rapidly did they advance that the list of casualties, considering the rain of shells, was small. Their objective for the day was Bois Frehaut. Picked Moroccan and Senegalese troops of the French, striking for the same point—in an odd competition of colored races on this day—were the first to arrive. The Germans, seeing what was up, were pounding Bois Frehaut with a heavy fire. It became too hot for the Moroccans and the Senegalese. They were forced to retreat.

Were our colored fighters really going to "see it through"? The fight was now getting hotter and hotter, for the Germans were bringing their full resistance to bear. The Fifty-sixth Regiment was forced to withdraw, but not until after they had stood up and borne a heavy loss. The First Battalion of the "Buffaloes," commanded by Maj. Charles L. Appleton, of New York, with colored company commanders and lieutenants, was called upon to hold the Germans at bay while the hard-hit Fifty-sixth retreated. Here, in confronting the enemy with an iron resistance, the "Buffaloes" won their *Croix de Guerre*.

A little later Bois Frehaut was taken by the Ninety-second. The Germans directed against the place a more murderous fire, but there was no driving out the colored men. The Stars and Stripes said of this fight:

"Probably the hardest fighting done by any Americans in the final hour was that which engaged the troops of the Twenty-eighth, Ninety-second, Eighty-first, and Seventh Divisions of the Second American Army, who launched a fire-eating attack above Vigneulles just at dawn on the 11th. It was no mild thing that last flare of the battle, and the order to cease firing did not reach the men in the front line until the last moment, when the runners sped with it from fox hole to fox hole."

Numerous officers and privates of the Ninety-second were commended for meritorious conduct by general orders. During the final engagement of the war the negro division held the line of Vandieres-St. Michel-Non-Norry. The Ninety-second suffered a total of 1,478 casualties.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGINEER SCHOOL.

Equipment and maintenance of the Engineer School, including purchase and repair of instruments, machinery, implements, models, and materials for the use of the school and for instruction of engineer troops in their special duties as sappers and miners; for land mining,

pontoniering, and signaling; for purchase and binding of professional works and periodicals of recent date treating on military and civil engineering and kindred scientific subjects for the library of the United States Engineers' School; for incidental expenses of the school, including chemicals, stationery, hardware, machinery, and boats; for pay of civilian clerks, draftsmen, electricians, mechanics, and laborers; compensation of civilian lecturers and payment of tuition fees of student officers at civil technical institutions; for unforeseen expenses; for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Secretary of War and made for the purpose of instruction: *Provided*, That the traveling expenses herein provided for shall be in lieu of mileage and other allowances; and to provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Engineer School by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and for other absolutely necessary expenses, \$50,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is there any significance in the committee leaving out the designation of the place where this engineer school is to be located? Heretofore it has always carried the designation "at Washington Barracks, D. C."

Mr. DENT. There is significance in it. The Engineer Department recommended that it be named Camp A. A. Humphreys. The committee declined to adopt the recommendation of the Engineer Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is this further significance, that the appropriation carried in this bill, which is \$20,000 more than last year—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Wisconsin reserve the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not. May be used at some other place than the present school at Washington Barracks?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The reason for the increase is this: Heretofore the engineer school has had from 15 to 40 students, while at the present time there are 72 students, graduates of one of the recent classes of the Military Academy at West Point. That number of students will probably be further increased during the fiscal year to about 125.

Mr. DENT. One hundred and twenty-five.

Mr. KAHN. And to take care of the greatly increased number of students it was deemed necessary to increase the amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. My last suggestion was that the appropriation could be utilized at some other school than that at Washington Barracks.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say frankly to the gentleman, and there is no need to conceal the matter, that the Engineer Department has acquired a considerable tract of land on the Potomac River at a place called Belvoir immediately south of Mount Vernon.

During the war they built quite a good many temporary structures there for training engineer officers and engineer enlisted men in the building of bridges, in the laying of pontoons, in the making of gases, in the building of trenches—in fact, all those things necessary for the proper training of troops under conditions that prevailed in this war. The engineers contend that the tract of land at Washington Barracks is altogether too small to enable them to carry on these various and necessary activities. They contend that the buildings down there at the Washington Barracks are used altogether for the machinery which they require for the training of engineer troops in certain specific things. They complain that there is no chance on that small tract of land to develop engineer troops as they should be developed, and so they want to expend a greater part of this money at Camp A. A. Humphreys, in Virginia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the bill by inserting after the word "school," in line 11, the words "at Washington Barracks, District of Columbia," and I want to be heard just for a moment on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 47, line 11, after the word "school," insert "at Washington Barracks, District of Columbia."

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the committee, but I want just to make a few statements, and I would like to have the attention of the gentlemen who are present. This matter was discussed in the committee. The language which I undertake to insert in the bill at this time has been carried in the bill in former years, and we are all aware where the engineer school is located. It is at the barracks here in the city of Washington. At the head of that Engineer Department we have a splendid officer in Gen. Black. He came before our committee and contended that it would be wisdom for us now to enter upon a scheme of building up a great engineering school at Camp Humphreys. After

discussing the matter somewhat it was decided not to do that, but I did not know that this language had been omitted from the bill until I came to examine it.

I opposed the entering upon this enterprise at this time for the reason that we have not determined, nor will we determine at this time, what the policy is to be, so far as our Military Establishment is concerned, and it will involve the expenditure of millions of dollars, and I think it would be the part of wisdom for this Congress, when so many men are talking economy and have been finding so much fault with the Committee on Military Affairs for the great appropriations we have brought in, at least to refuse to give the War Department even the opportunity of doing this thing without expressly authorizing them to do so by law, and I hope that the amendment will be adopted. If in the future we should decide that we want a larger engineer school, and that we want to build it up at Camp Humphreys, regardless of the fact that we have heard a great deal about the mud and conditions at Camp Humphreys—if people want it there, after giving the matter mature deliberation and consideration, all well and good; but I think it will be a mistake to do it at this time.

Mr. DENT. May I ask my colleague a question?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I am not in entire disagreement with the suggestion of the gentleman, but it is a fact that Gen. Black urged this most insistently upon the committee?

Mr. McKENZIE. He did not urge it any more insistently than a great many officers urged other things, but the committee declined to do it.

Mr. DENT. That is the fact, is it not?

Mr. McKENZIE. Why, certainly Gen. Black did; but there was no action striking out the language—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not happen to be present when it was done.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes; we had a vote on it.

Mr. McKENZIE. But even if the committee did it, if they decided to do this, if you want to go right on and build up an expensive Military Establishment, this is a good way to start.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I ask the gentleman a question or two?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It does not make much difference how many men we have in the Army, the instruction of those we do have there should be just as good if the numbers are small as it would be if the numbers were large. In other words, an engineer wants to be as competent in an Army of 100,000 men as in an Army of 500,000 men?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And one of the particular essentials in training for modern engineering is to get experience in a variety of terrain.

Mr. McKENZIE. But it is a very short distance from Washington Barracks down to Camp Humphreys.

Mr. MANN. There is as much terrain around Washington as around Camp Humphreys.

Mr. KAHN. Owned by the Government?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. McKENZIE. The fact of the matter is, this is to build up another great institution as part of our Military Establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I always like to agree with my friend from Illinois if I can do so, but I think he is in error about this. This war has shown that the Engineer Corps is one of the most important of all the branches of the Army. The first troops we sent to France were Engineer troops. They had to build bridges. They had to build docks. They had to build depots at the railroad stations. They had to lay railroad tracks. They had to lay railroad sidings. They had to run the railroads themselves, and all of that training must be given to particular engineer soldiers in order that we may carry on that work, so important to the Army in case we should ever be drawn into war again.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that all of those engineer regiments that went over there in the beginning of the war were volunteer regiments taken from the railroads and other great business institutions of the country?

Mr. KAHN. That is true, but we had some engineer troops that had been trained in the Army with them. We had Engineer officers who had had the additional year's training at the Engineers' School after they had graduated from West Point.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion there?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. There should be no confusion between engineer troops proper in a military sense and these transportation engineers that were employed in an entirely different field of endeavor, so far as first military purposes were concerned.

Mr. KAHN. Of course, engineer troops are required to build pontoon bridges. The ordinary engineers know nothing about that.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The science of military engineering is a distinct thing from industrial engineering and the other corps that were associated in the early part of the war with the Engineer Corps of the Army.

Mr. KAHN. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to strike out a couple of words in his amendment, as the Chair thought. The Chair is not certain about it. Does the gentleman wish them stricken out?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the words will be stricken out. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE]. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKENZIE: Page 47, line 11, after the word "school," insert "at Washington Barracks, D. C."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the execution of topographic or other surveys, the securing of such extra topographic data as may be required, and the preparation and printing of maps required for military purposes, to be immediately available and remain available until December 31, 1920: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to secure the assistance wherever practicable of the United States Geological Survey, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or other mapping agencies of the Government in this work and to allot funds therefor to them from this appropriation, \$200,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I overlooked an item, and I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph entitled "Engineer Operations in the Field."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph indicated on page 48 to take up a matter that was overlooked. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I wish information. I notice in this paragraph there is a provision for "the construction of storehouses within and outside of the District of Columbia" and the purchase of "motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles." I believe those words should be eliminated.

Mr. DENT. I am perfectly willing that that should be done.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order on that paragraph, page 49, line 2, on the words "construction or," and, on line 3, upon the word "purchase."

The CHAIRMAN. The points of order are sustained against the words indicated. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF MILITARY AND POST ROADS, BRIDGES, AND TRAILS, ALASKA.

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Territory of Alaska, to be immediately available, \$100,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the necessity of making this amount immediately available, if I may inquire of a member of the committee?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think it has been explained to the committee several times, that the working months in Alaska for this outdoor labor range between May and August. They divide themselves practically half and half on either side of the division of the fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Some years back, as many years as five years ago, I reserved a point of order on this paragraph when the amount carried was \$300,000, and at that time I had an understanding with the then chairman of the committee, Judge James Hay, that the amount would only be carried for perhaps one year or more longer. The information that I then obtained from persons who were acquainted with affairs in Alaska was to the effect that this was merely to give a berth to some old superannuated Army officer who did not do much with the money except maybe hibernate up there for part of the year.

I make these statements in all seriousness, and now we still find this item cropping up here, not in the same large amount but this old superannuated Army officer is still desiring to continue experiments in road construction at an expense of \$100,000. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the life, whereabouts, and welfare of this old Army officer who used to supervise the expenditure of this appropriation?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think the old Army officer must have been such a character in the gentleman's imagination that he himself knows more about him than anybody else.

Mr. STAFFORD. He is not a character of the imagination. I got the information concerning him from people acquainted with the work up in Alaska.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The information that the gentleman got a few years ago, to the effect that this item would disappear from the appropriation bill, must have been one of those shortsighted promises that I remember frequently meeting with respect to appropriations, which can be attributed in this case largely to the dazzling sunshine reflected from the Alaskan snow, which has a peculiar effect on the human vision, as I understand. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman shows by that reference an absolute ignorance of conditions in Alaska and the purpose for which this money is purported to be used. This is for the fertile valleys of Alaska, where they raise wheat and potatoes, and not in the far northern regions where glaciers and ice fields are the rule.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am glad the gentleman has limited his estimate of my ignorance to ignorance of Alaska. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. The expenditure of this money does not reach to the frozen north in the Arctic Circle.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It reaches as far as it will go. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. This expenditure by the old Army officer does not approach the Arctic regions at all.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This old Army officer has, perhaps, approached a more congenial clime, because he is not there now, if he ever existed. [Laughter.] In fact, this \$100,000 is a diminishing sum in the appropriation bill, and it is now diminished because of the scarcity of labor up there this year. There is a certainty that unless the roads already built up there are maintained in repair to some reasonable extent, the traffic in that region will practically be put to a standstill.

Mr. STAFFORD. The hearings which I read when I did give the matter special consideration disclosed the fact that the money was being wasted on the building of bridges not connected with transportation at all.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This sum was intended to apply on highways leading to Army posts. That was one of the foundations of this sum. Then, another consideration, I believe, was the highways through the territory tributary to the railroad. There is, in addition to this appropriation, as I seem to remember, money raised by the people of Alaska themselves through their Territorial government. Then there is some other fund which supplies some money, too, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. STAFFORD. Though the information furnished by the gentleman is not very elucidating or informing, nevertheless I do not wish to do any injury to the appropriation or to Alaska. If I were certain that this same old Army officer was supervising this appropriation, I might make a point of order, but I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE SERVICE.

For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, and advertising, stationery, typewriters, and adding machines, including their exchange, and office furniture, tools, and instruments of service; for incidental expenses of the Ordnance Service, and those attending practical trials and tests of ordnance, small arms, and other ordnance stores; for publications for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office; subscriptions to periodicals, which may be paid for in advance; and payment for mechanical labor in the office of the Chief of Ordnance; and for purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, \$3,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, Mr. Chairman. Here we also have authority for the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles, and I make the point of order on the word "purchase," in line 20, page 50.

Mr. DENT. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MANUFACTURE OF ARMS.

For manufacturing, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories, \$2,500,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will some member of the committee inform the House as to how much of this appropriation is to be used in connection with the manufacture of arms?

Mr. DENT. The War Department did not furnish us any information as to how much was to be used for manufacture.

Mr. STAFFORD. When I read the paragraph the thought arose in my mind that the War Department would have plenty of small arms by reason of preparedness for the war, so that a further appropriation for the manufacture of small arms would not be necessary.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. They did suggest that they would continue the manufacture of Springfield rifles to take the place of the converted Enfields that we had to put into the field to supply our troops during the war, the object being to have a standardized arm in the hands of our troops and the ordinarily necessary reserve supply of them; but there was no general manufacture of rifles contemplated.

Mr. McKENZIE. About 300 a day.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. As suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], about 300 a day.

Mr. STAFFORD. That money will be expended at the Watertown or Springfield Arsenal?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. At the Springfield Arsenal. That is where we make the rifles. Of pistols and small arms of that character the Army has long been deficient, and in the attempt to keep up a normal standard supply of them the manufacture will be continued, although it will not lead to anything excessive, even under this appropriation.

Mr. DENT. In other words, we have a sufficient supply now, but we do not want to stop the production entirely.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the chairman of the committee also inform the House as to the need of providing for the manufacture of ammunition for the Army, although there are large stores of ammunition? That manufacture is provided for in the preceding paragraph.

Mr. DENT. That is simply to authorize the department to continue the development of the manufacture of ammunition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not for the purpose of providing large stores, because I assume there are ample stores at the present time. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, manufacture, test, repair, and maintenance of automatic machine rifles or other automatic or semiautomatic guns, including their mounts, sights, and equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture, \$1,500,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on that paragraph, which provides for the manufacture of automatic machine rifles. Is it proposed to manufacture a different rifle from that which was adopted during the war?

Mr. DENT. That item, like the other, is carried there just for the authorization of the general purpose. There is no particular rifle—

Mr. McKENZIE. If the chairman of the committee will pardon me, I think the testimony before the committee was that they were experimenting and undertaking to develop a little heavier machine gun than we now have; that is, something similar to the heavier Browning gun.

Mr. STAFFORD. This fund is to be utilized for that purpose?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARMORED MOTOR CARS.

For the purchase, manufacture, test, repair, and maintenance of armored motor cars, to remain available until the end of the fiscal year 1920, \$500,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain so that the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his point of order. Some years ago we provided for the first armored motor car, even over the objection or the want of recommendation of the War Department. They proved to be something of a failure in the war. This item is intended to be expended in the development of tanks, which would come under the head of armored

motor cars. It is not for the building of armored motor cars, but for the tank development.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the work to be undertaken?

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not say which particular Government arsenal the work is to be done at.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, with the illuminating information which the gentleman from Illinois always furnishes, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARMING, EQUIPPING, AND TRAINING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

Purchase of horses for mounted units, \$1,882,901.58.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, if the Government is seeking to sell horses, what is the necessity for this provision?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that they do not purpose to buy any more horses. They have more horses than they need. We make an appropriation in this bill of \$100,000 to be expended for the purchase of young colts at remount stations under an agreement entered into that has been carried for a number of years. They have a certain number of stallions there and they are breeding first-class horses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here is an appropriation of \$1,882,000 for the purchase of horses in connection with the National Guard.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is not that a credit on which the National Guard can draw from the quartermaster's stock of horses? We would not be selling horses at one end of the Army and buying them at the other.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve a point of order against it, so that I may get the information as to the policy of the committee in appropriating this large sum. Here are appropriations running above a million dollars for Army equipment and training of the National Guard. I think we ought to have some specific information about these large appropriations; for instance, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the need of purchasing horses for mounted units of the National Guard.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, this provision is carried in the bill in regard to the building up of the National Guard, at least during the next year, to 106,000 men. Every National Guard unit that was in existence the day that war was declared was called into the service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recall that when the National Guard was transferred into the National Army in my own State, where the State troops had equipment they sold their horses and equipment at public auction. Is it the purpose to appropriate money to the States, in cooperation with them, so that they can again purchase horses, or is it the purpose that the War Department will transfer horses in large numbers back to the National Guard?

Mr. DENT. The proviso at the end indicates that it is the purpose of the War Department to transfer horses and not use any money where it is not necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the proviso is limited to such articles as clothing and equipment and material, and I question whether that is broad enough in its phraseology to cover horses.

Mr. DENT. Does not the gentleman think that if a Cavalry regiment is organized in the National Guard that that would be a part of the equipment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I question whether that phraseology in connection with the clause preceding would be given that construction.

Mr. DENT. What is the gentleman's objection to this item? The gentleman is not opposed to the National Guard?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am strongly in favor of reviving the National Guard. It is a suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] that we have large numbers of horses and that we ought not to go into the market now and purchase horses when they can be transferred from the National Government to the different States.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman will find that it was intended to mean that all these items, which begin on line 10, page 53, and run down to the proviso, were to be furnished in kind as nearly as possible to the last penny, and that the appropriation set forth here is to establish a credit for the National Guard in order that it might draw in kind up to that amount.

Mr. DENT. I think in line with what the gentleman from Vermont suggests that we were given figures showing that the appropriation would be something like \$50,000,000 for a National Guard strength of something like 106,000 men, but with this proviso put in there authorizing the transfer of surplus equipment it was reduced to \$14,000,000. I think we have it in shape so that the Government expenses under this appropriation

will be something like \$14,000,000, and the surplus stock will be transferred to the guard so as to equip a National Guard force of 106,000 men.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no disposition anywhere to prevent the reorganization and rehabilitation of the National Guard. We all recognize it as an essential unit in our Army organization.

Mr. DENT. I will read the gentleman what Gen. Heavey said:

The total amount of the appropriation, if the rider is not passed, for 106,200 men would be \$50,554,428.82; but if the rider goes through, it will require only \$14,630,847.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then from that I take it that this amount is not to be used as a credit, but is to be used as a direct appropriation to the various States.

Mr. DENT. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Is it not a fact that a great many States which maintain the National Guard have no mounted troops?

Mr. DENT. That is true.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Then does the gentleman think it is absolutely necessary to appropriate four and a half million dollars for the purchase of horses for the National Guard when they are not to use cavalry?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman has not these figures right. The amount is \$1,882,000.

Mr. McCLINTIC. But with the forage, bedding, and compensation of help in connection with the purchase of horses it amounts to four and a half million dollars.

Mr. DENT. But the gentleman must not overlook the fact that you need horses in the Artillery as well as in the Cavalry.

Mr. McCLINTIC. If we have 100,000 head of horses more than are needed at the present time, and they are being sold at a reduction of 50 per cent of what they cost, would not an amendment authorizing the Secretary of War to turn over to the National Guard such horses as they need them be all that is necessary?

Mr. DENT. I think this does that. That was the intention.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, this subject has been somewhat considered by the Committee on Appropriations in respect to the policy of disposing of this large number of horses in the possession of the Government. The War Department believes that if we are going to keep the horses and feed them, at the high price of feed, in a short time they will eat their heads off, to use a colloquial expression; we recognized that it is economy to permit the War Department to dispose of these horses. We are providing for the reorganization of the National Guard. It may be months or more than a year before the States can organize so that they would need horses, and to keep those horses at a tremendous expense, the gentleman would see, would not be a very good business policy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office rent, inspector-instructors, \$9,272.48.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, following the words "office rent, inspector-instructors, \$9,272.48," insert "pay of the National Guard, armory drill, \$4,467,171.86."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that that item was omitted from the bill by the printer in some way and that simply makes up the \$14,000,000 we appropriate for the support of the National Guard. It was omitted by the printer.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is the only instance, I believe, where the printer omitted any amount in this bill?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that is one reason why we should not take up much time if it is the only instance because it just adds a little to the grand total.

Mr. DENT. The amount we agreed upon was \$14,000,000 for the National Guard and that makes the amount conform.

Mr. STAFFORD. How is this money to be used?

Mr. DENT. It is for the purpose of providing under the national-defense act for the monthly drills.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if the same mathematician figured out the expense incident to the items in lines 3 and 4 and that in line 14.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit—

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I notice travel of Federal officers is \$9,272.48. That is for travel.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That 48 cents is war tax. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I suppose that is true, but the item in line 14, office rent, also is \$9,272.48.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have a very expert computer carried in this bill who reduces these estimates to a nicety.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I congratulate the department.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to issue from surplus stores now on hand and purchased for the United States Army, such articles of clothing and equipment matériel as may be needed by the National Guard organized under the provisions of the act of June 3, 1916, which law is still in force and applicable to State forces. This issue will be made without charge against militia appropriations and will be reimbursed in kind for all Federal property brought into service by State troops. Issue will be made as soon as the provisions of act of June 3, 1916, shall have been fulfilled: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 62, act of June 3, 1916, will be considered fulfilled if the first strength mentioned therein be attained by June 30, 1919, and the other increments provided therein be attained by successive years thereafter: *Provided further*, That this will not prevent any State from compliance with the provisions of section 62 as now worded: *Provided further*, That the appropriations and provisions of this act referring to the National Guard become applicable and available upon the date this becomes a law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to make some inquiry in reference to these various provisos. Can the gentleman inform the committee what are the provisions of section 62 of the National Guard act?

Mr. DENT. I can show it to the gentleman in half a minute. I can not remember that by number.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been furnished information by one of the members of the committee, and I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, line 17, page 54, by inserting, after the word "such," the word "animals."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 17, page 54, after the word "such," amend by inserting the word "animals."

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, this is to make it perfectly plain that the Secretary can use these horses if there are any on hand, as well as clothing and equipment.

Mr. DENT. I have no objection.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, if the chairman will pardon me, I just want to extend my congratulations still further. I notice that the expenses mentioned on page 53, line 17, were \$39,739.20, and that the expenses mentioned in line 6, page 54, were \$39,739.20. I wondered, when they made this calculation, if they did it with a rubber stamp?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, he will notice that the item at the top of page 54 is \$19,869.60, which is one-half of the two items he has just pointed out. [Laughter.]

If we go through, we can find many items of similarity. This keen computer was a marvel, and ought to be inquired into.

The Clerk read as follows:

For procuring arms, including pistols, ammunition, equipment, etc., for issue and use in connection with Home Guard organizations in pursuance of the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the issue to States and Territories and the District of Columbia of rifles and other property for the equipment of organizations of Home Guards," approved June 14, 1917, authorizing issues to Home Guard organizations, \$25,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is my impression, though it may be faulty, that the Home Guard organizations were merely to take the place of the National Guard organizations while the National Guard units were merged into the National Army. What is the need of making permanent appropriation for the supplying of arms and ammunition and equipment to Home Guard organizations?

Mr. DENT. It is merely a nominal appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, it is not reduced to the nicety of cents. It is a lump-sum appropriation of \$25,000. That is nominal in the consideration of a bill carrying over a billion.

Mr. DENT. I will say frankly that personally I never considered there was any necessity for this organization. They thought it ought to be continued and some sort of sum carried in the event that prior to the time of the reorganization of the National Guard there might be some necessity for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the gentleman will pardon me for one moment, I want to call his attention to an item in line 9, of

\$1,324.64, on page 54, and an item in line 12 of \$132,464. The difference is made just by shifting commas there and substituting periods. I just wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the method of very accurate calculation out there.

Mr. DENT. Oh, well, the gentleman can be as funny as he pleases—

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I can not be as funny as this calculation.

Mr. DENT. I have the floor. The gentleman can be as funny as he pleases about this proposition. But everybody knows that the National Guard was brought into the Federal service at the beginning of this war, and the whole proposition of reorganizing it and giving it a chance to reorganize was a new proposition. And only to-day a Member of this House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], paid a high tribute to the Rainbow Division, and especially the old Fourth Alabama Regiment, for the work they did in France. I appreciated it, and I take this opportunity to tell him how much I appreciate it, on the floor of this House.

Now, this is entirely conjectural, and there is nothing funny about it. If you do not want to organize the National Guard, do not make any appropriation for it at all. But if any Member of this House is not willing to admit that the National Guard in France and in the trenches did its duty and showed its services to this country, then I would like to see him stand upon the floor and say it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I think that explains the method of calculation adopted by the department thoroughly. I will withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for use in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, established by the act approved June 3, 1916, is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year 1920, \$100.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Are we to understand by this phraseology that only \$100 is to be available, or is the appropriation carried last year, \$2,920,000, to be available?

Mr. DENT. I can explain that to the gentleman. The object of this appropriation was simply to carry the item in the bill. But we were told that there was a sufficient surplus of supplies on hand to furnish these ordnance supplies without making any additional appropriation; and the \$100 item was merely intended to carry that item in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology adopted by the committee is rather strange. It says:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for use in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, established by the act approved June 3, 1916, is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year 1920, \$100.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman was reading one section and I was reading another. I have no objection to that being stricken out now. I move to strike out the language, "is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year 1920."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENT moves to amend, on page 56, line 18, by striking out the words "is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year 1920."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE SUPPLIES FOR MILITARY EQUIPMENT OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for issue to schools and colleges in pursuance of the provisions of section 56 of the act approved June 3, 1916, \$100.

The appropriations contained herein shall be available for the payment of obligations on account of the existing emergency incurred prior to the passage of this act or prior to June 30, 1918, and which are properly chargeable to such appropriations: *Provided*, That the appropriations herein made for the support of the Army and the National Guard are available for such printing, binding, and blank books as may be necessary in putting in effect the objects of the appropriations: *And provided further*, That hereafter printing, binding, and blank books required for use outside of the District of Columbia in connection with the support of the Army and the National Guard may be done or procured elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office when in the opinion of the Secretary of War such work can be more advantageously done or procured locally, the cost thereof to be paid from the proper appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I think I might settle this whole thing by making a motion to strike out all of the language on page 57, beginning with line 3 and ending with line 19. After a conference with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I am con-

vinced that perhaps this language might embarrass the bill that was passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Kentucky was only concerned with the phraseology prior to the proviso.

Mr. GORDON. It is only a nominal appropriation anyway.

Mr. DENT. The other is immaterial.

Mr. STAFFORD. The quickest way, then, is to give it the fatal shot of a point of order. So I make the point of order.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE.

That, in addition to the Regular Army as now organized under the provisions of "An Act for making further and more efficient provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, there shall be raised and organized under the provisions of "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, as amended, a force sufficient to maintain an aggregate commissioned and enlisted strength of 23,579 officers and 509,900 enlisted men.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Clerk finish reading the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. He has proceeded far enough now to show that it is clearly subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can restate his point of order when the Clerk has finished reading the paragraph. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vacancies created in the commissioned ranks shall be filled in the ratio in which the additional enlisted men herein authorized are procured and in accordance with the existing law. The enlisted force for the Regular Army shall be raised by voluntary enlistments for periods of three years and for the additional forces herein authorized by voluntary enlistments for the period of one year. All existing enlistments for a longer period than three years shall be terminated as though made for three years, and after expiration of one year's honorable service any enlisted man serving within the continental limits of the United States, whose company, troop, battery, or detachment commander shall report him as proficient and sufficiently trained, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be furloughed to the Regular Army Reserves, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph. It is clearly new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order against the paragraph. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have had an understanding with gentlemen that nothing would be done here except to read the legislative feature of this bill and then that certain gentlemen who had amendments to offer could offer them, so that it would be understood that there would be no vote taken on the proposition to-night.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not care to interfere with any arrangements the gentleman has made, but no amendments are in order until the point of order is disposed of. I am willing to reserve the point of order, but no sort of amendment is in order until the point of order has been disposed of.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen may offer and have printed in the RECORD—not as pending, but for information—any amendments they choose to offer in relation to this matter if it goes out on a point of order.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will ask the chairman of the committee if an amendment would be in order on Monday?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama this question: Has the committee agreed on any amendment touching this, if this goes out on a point of order, or anything in the way of a substitute for it?

Mr. DENT. The committee has not taken any action itself.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does not the gentleman think that between now and Monday the committee ought to do something?

Mr. DENT. Some members of the committee, including the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] and I, have, among ourselves, agreed upon an amendment that we think ought to be introduced.

Mr. RAYBURN. That will be in the RECORD on Monday?

Mr. DENT. Yes. That is the reason why I am trying to get this arrangement.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that any amendment desired can be offered now for information.

Mr. MANN. Gentlemen can present amendments now, to be printed in the RECORD, to be offered later, as a matter of convenience.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will that preclude amendments being offered on Monday?

Mr. MANN. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that gentlemen having amendments to this part of the bill may present the same and have them printed in the RECORD for the purpose of information. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, does that mean that we are not to read the balance of the bill to-night?

Mr. MANN. I suppose so.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought you were going to get rid of this.

Mr. MANN. I do not care whether a point of order is made or not.

Mr. WINGO. I do not care whether there is a unanimous-consent agreement or not, except that points of order reserved shall not be prejudiced thereby.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending. A point of order was made to the pending paragraph by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. WINGO. I want to have it understood that the offering of these amendments shall not prejudice the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Illinois had to do only with printing amendments for information.

Mr. WINGO. I want it made clear that the point of order is reserved, regardless of any amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean that we are going to rise now?

Mr. DENT. It does after I have called attention to one or two corrections that I would like to have made.

Mr. RAYBURN. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if this committee meets at 11 o'clock Monday, I shall not be able to be here, but I want to say that if I were here I would make a point of order, and I hope some member of the committee will make a point of order against an item in the bill, on page 60, beginning with the proviso, because it is clearly subject to a point of order and has been objected to here several times.

Mr. FOSTER. Which is that?

Mr. RAYBURN. It is the policy of pensioning people who are citizens of other countries. I think we ought not to start in on that.

Mr. FOSTER. This man came here to help our people, and the poor fellow lost his eyesight.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, and to have it printed under the rule as a substitute for the language presented in the bill.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen will send the amendments to the desk and they will be printed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY] send amendments to the desk. They will be printed.

Following are the amendments referred to:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKENZIE:

"That the enlisted force for the Regular Army, as provided for in the act of June 3, 1916, known as the national defense act, shall be raised by voluntary enlistments for periods of three years; and all existing enlistments for a longer period than three years shall be terminated as though made for three years, and after the expiration of one year's honorable service any enlisted man serving within the continental limits of the United States, whose company, troop, battery, or detachment commander shall report him as proficient and sufficiently trained, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be furloughed to the Regular Army Reserves, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That so far as the same relates to the Army of the United States and the War Department, an 'Act to authorize the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and a more efficient concentration of the Government,' approved May 30, 1918, is hereby repealed."

"Within the authorized strength provided by law, the President shall form or continue such field or tactical units, including a construction corps, as he shall deem necessary, to be organized as he may prescribe."

Amendment offered by Mr. CURRY of California: Page 62, after line 12, insert the following: "All officers, enlisted men, and Army field clerks who were in the military service of the United States on November 11, 1918, are hereby declared to have been and to be entitled, when their resignations have been accepted or when they have been discharged, to honorable discharges from the United States Army; and that the Secretary of War and those authorized by him to issue discharges be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to issue such honorable discharges to those officers, enlisted men, and Army field clerks who were in the military service of the United States on November 11, 1918; said honorable discharges shall be issued without requiring those who have been or who may hereafter be discharged from the military service of the United States to make application therefor: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to those who have been or may hereafter be discharged from the military service of the United States as a result of the finding of a disciplinary body."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 16, line 13, for the purpose of changing the amount for the pay of the enlisted men of the Army, in view of the point of order that was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin as to the increased pay. I should like to dispose of that.

Mr. MANN. What is the amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Let it be reported for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Page 16, line 13, after the word "line," strike out "\$137,861,770.72" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$79,384,164."

Mr. MANN. I think I will object to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman withhold that a moment? I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I have just offered be printed in the RECORD. It is for the purpose of trying to correct the amount of money in view of the point of order.

Mr. MANN. It has been read.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, we also passed over the subject of aviation.

Mr. MANN. That was passed over at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], until we finished the reading of the bill.

Mr. DENT. That is very true, but I think if the gentleman will wait until I make my request he will not object.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that I will object. I will just state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asked me to see that it did not come up for consideration until the end of the bill was reached.

Mr. DENT. I have no intention of bringing it up. The gentleman is not giving me an opportunity to make my request.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw temporarily my point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent that in lieu of the language beginning with page 9, line 6, down to and including the end of line 10, page 15, which is the appropriation in regard to the Air Service, the following substitute be printed in the RECORD for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Strike out all the language beginning on line 6, page 9, down to and including the words "all appurtenances," on line 10, page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"AIR SERVICE."

"Creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools course of instruction for aviation students, including cost of equipment, and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of students; purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction at aviation schools; purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; to maintain and replace the equipment of organizations already in service; equipment, maintenance, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, fields for testing and experimental work; procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, telephones, telegraphs, and sewerage; purchase of stoves and other cooking and heating apparatus, kitchen and table ware, and furniture and equipment for kitchens, mess halls, officers' quarters, barracks, hospitals, and other buildings, screens, lockers, refrigerators, and all other equipment; salaries and wages of civilian employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary; experimental investigation, and purchase and development of new types of aircraft and aviation engines; purchase, manufacture, maintenance, repair, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith. And also for the purchase or manufacture and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes, \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That claims not exceeding \$250 in amount for damages to persons and private property, resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad, may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post, and approved by the Director of Military Aeronautics: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$150,000."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, at the end of line 24, on page 15, I offer the following amendment, which the militia division think is necessary—

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman can not offer the amendment.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to return to page 15, line 24, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. Let the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. Let us have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The right to object is reserved. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: At the end of line 24, page 15, insert "Pay of officers, National Guard, \$100."

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I think, Mr. Chairman, that these amendments ought to be considered after the completion of the reading of the bill. The gentleman ought not to come in here with amendments in this way, when other amendments are being offered for information. I will object for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I send up an amendment which I desire to have printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas sends up an amendment which he desires to have printed in the Record. By unanimous consent that will be done.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TILLMAN: On page 61 strike out lines 19 to 25 and insert the following:

"That no part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available unless the Secretary of War shall continue in force the regulations made providing for the distinctive stripe or chevron indicating service overseas, and he shall invalidate all orders and regulations requiring officers and soldiers who were deprived of the privilege of overseas service from wearing the distinctive stripe or chevron now required."

On motion of Mr. DENT, the committee rose; and Mr. CRISP having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 15835) had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WILSON of Illinois, for five days, on account of illness.

HOOR OF MEETING ON MONDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there is to be a session of the House to-morrow.

Mr. KITCHIN. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. on Monday. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire whether the business usually in order on Monday will be considered?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to ask unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock on Monday we dispense with further business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. That will give us five hours for the consideration of that calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. on Monday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock on next Monday afternoon the business under the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock next Monday afternoon the business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall be suspended. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I am perfectly willing, as far as I am concerned, to go on with this bill on Monday at 4 o'clock if between 11 a. m. and 4 o'clock we attend to the business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar instead of wasting an hour or two hours on a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. KITCHIN. I presume that is the intention.

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to put that in the understanding.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There ought not to be any misunderstanding about that. There is a bill upon the calendar, the Bankhead-Smith bill, touching a change of appropriation that is under the control of the Vocational Education Board, that everybody is for, so far as I know.

Mr. KITCHIN. And there is no extra appropriation?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; merely a change of appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. And it gives it to whom?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is a change of appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. To be administered by somebody else?

Mr. KITCHIN. It is in connection with the training of wounded soldiers.

Mr. CANNON. That is the present expenditure?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is the present appropriation, and is to be transferred from one division to another; it does not add to the appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. I am not speaking about that, but I wanted to know whether there was a new agency created?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; it provides for the operation of existing law, except that it coalesces the purposes of the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. This subject has been given some consideration by the Appropriations Committee in connection with the sundry civil bill.

Mr. MANN. If there is no objection to it, it will not require a motion to suspend the rules. I think we ought to get through with the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I have no bill on it myself and am not interested in any bill that is on it. But if a bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar is not passed by Monday it will probably never pass unless it is a Senate bill. We have had this thing occur for several Mondays—and I have no criticism of the Speaker; far from it: At 2 or 3 o'clock, it may be a little later, recognition was given for a motion to suspend the rules, and I believe the rules have not been suspended in a single instance. It takes time, and during that time we might pass many bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar to which no one objects, instead of taking up motions to suspend the rules, where there is almost sure to be 40 minutes' debate and usually a roll call that takes another 30 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman to state that he would not object, in the event that it was understood that no motion to suspend the rules would be entertained?

Mr. MANN. Practically so. I have no objection to a motion to suspend the rules after you finish the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Illinois means to have only the Unanimous Consent Calendar considered and no motion to suspend the rules?

Mr. MANN. I mean as far as possible to protect the rights of as many Members as we can and give them a chance on the Unanimous Consent Calendar rather than to use up the time on motions to suspend the rules, which probably would not prevail if there is opposition. If there is no opposition it can be done by unanimous consent. We have a long Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If that condition is attached to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina, I, of course, will have to object.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman realizes that the gentleman is undertaking to provide for a motion to suspend the rules on a Senate bill. The last six days of the session are given over to motions to suspend the rules.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there is only this one day remaining for the consideration of the lengthy Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am perfectly willing that the full day should be taken up under the rules.

Mr. STAFFORD. And as it has been taken up on prior Mondays, it has been the habit to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar until half past 2 and then recognize Members to move to suspend the rules.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is perfectly all right. Gentlemen can take care of themselves at that particular time, when that arises.

Mr. MANN. Oh, they can not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know why.

Mr. MANN. They do not get the chance.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Illinois can.

Mr. MANN. I very seldom have anything on the calendar.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I never have had in my life.

Mr. MANN. This Senate bill, of course, can be taken care of later.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, we ought to pass it.

Mr. MANN. There are a lot of things on the Unanimous Consent Calendar also that we ought to pass. We want to give an opportunity to pass most of the things, but the gentleman does not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think he is fair in that statement?

Mr. MANN. It is true; I do not know whether it is fair or not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Committee on Rules, of course, is being constantly pressed.

Mr. MANN. I have a bill before the committee myself, which I hope it will report.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I know; and I think probably we will take care of that. The gentleman means his resolution?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then let us do this: Go until 5 o'clock, and we then will have the usual number of hours, with the extra hour obtained by meeting at 11 o'clock. We can go until 5 o'clock on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is this bill the gentleman from Tennessee is talking about a Senate bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is; and it is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why not make this arrangement? If they get through with the Unanimous Consent Calendar before 4 o'clock—

Mr. KITCHIN. Then one gentleman will just sit here and object to everything, and we will get through the Unanimous Consent Calendar in an hour. I believe we can all come to this agreement. We usually have adjourned at 5 o'clock, and we are going to meet at 11 o'clock. Let us say that we will dispose of the Unanimous Consent Calendar at 5 o'clock, and then we will have the six hours of time.

Mr. MANN. If we can wait until 5 o'clock. It seems to me that we ought to dispose of these bills. This will be the last opportunity. Gentlemen want to come in and take up the time with a bill that can be passed at any time before the end of the Congress, motions to suspend the rules being in order at any time within the last six days, and in a short session the six days are fixed.

Mr. KITCHIN. Can not we agree that the Unanimous Consent Calendar should run until half past 3?

Mr. MANN. I think if we have the time on Monday, we ought to put it in on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I think we ought to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar clear through on Monday.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have agreed to meet at 11 o'clock, with the tacit understanding that we would take up that calendar.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let us take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar until 4 o'clock.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then let us let it go along under the general rules of the House. Mr. BANKHEAD ought to have recognition to move to suspend the rules on this bill, and if conditions are going to be imposed upon the Speaker that he shall not recognize anyone to move to suspend the rules, then we would better proceed under the general rules.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know whether I have the floor, but if so I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman seems to be holding the floor in pretty good shape. Could not the gentleman from Alabama secure consent from the Speaker to move to suspend the rules—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, the gentleman from Illinois objects to that very thing.

Mr. WALSH. But the gentleman will not let me finish the inquiry. Does not the gentleman think the gentleman from Alabama could secure consent from the Speaker to make his motion to suspend the rules on the sixth day prior to the adjournment of this session of Congress?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know about that; I do not know what the condition of business will be in the last six days.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Massachusetts, if I may be permitted, that this bill is so imperative in its character and nature and in the benefits that will be derived from its passage that it ought to be considered immediately for the reason that hundreds of men, discharged soldiers, are being discharged from the hospital without any opportunity on the part of the Educational Board to get in touch with them in order to give them the benefit of this retraining provided by law.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but you will have to wait until the 27th of the month before the bill can become a law.

Mr. MANN. It will not become a law until the 4th of March, anyhow.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There was an agreement in the Committee on Rules—if there is any representative of the minority present from the Committee on Rules—

Mr. MANN. They are always present, like the ladies.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And there has been an agreement that they would not report a resolution to make this privileged, because it could be called up under suspension next Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Has the gentleman from North Carolina any request to prefer?

Mr. KITCHIN. Just one moment; let us have that understanding, that only the Bankhead bill will be—

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to spend all day Monday on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Rules Committee, I understand, unanimously believed that this bill ought to have a rule.

Mr. MANN. Oh, gentlemen know perfectly well this bill can be passed during the last six days of the session, and it is not fair to the House to try to insist upon taking up the time now that ought to be given to other bills.

Mr. RAYBURN. The truth is that all the time ought to be given to the Unanimous Consent Calendar because there are many very important bills on that calendar that ought to be passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what the gentleman from Illinois is trying to bring about now.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 16, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting list of records, papers, and documents recommended for destruction (H. Doc. No. 1795); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations required by the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1796); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for contingent, Navy, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1797); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for censorship of mails, enforcement of the trading-with-the-enemy and espionage acts., etc., Panama Canal, for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1798); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation to cover amount required to complete the Coast Guard cutters authorized by act of August 29, 1916, March 4, 1917, and March 28, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1799); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Fisheries for a power lighter for Alaska fur-seal islands, for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1800); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Postmaster General, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation, payable from the postal revenues, for twine and tying devices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1801); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Geological Survey for examination and classification of lands for homesteads, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1802); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Librarian of Congress submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Library of Congress for distribution of card in-

dexes, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1803); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication to the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the General Land Office for classification of lands involved in the Oregon and California forfeiture suit (H. Doc. No. 1804); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a proposed clause of legislation desired in connection with the authorization for passenger-carrying vehicles contained in the appropriation for general expenses of the Geological Survey (H. Doc. No. 1805); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15987) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; and to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1070), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. WALTON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4743) for the relief of Francis Stewart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1073), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 15980) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 15981) to allow certain sums to soldiers, sailors, and marines who were injured in the line of duty; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 15982) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Monticello, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 15983) to abolish the bureau of Comptroller of the Currency and the office of Comptroller of the Currency, and authorizing the Federal Reserve Board to perform the duties thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 15984) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Opelika, Lee County, Ala., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 15985) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Southampton, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 15986) to incorporate the Mothers of Democracy of the United States of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 15987) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; and to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 15988) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Park Ridge, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15989) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blairstown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 15990) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of cannons and ordnance to designated towns and cities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 15991) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Oakland City College, at Oakland City, Ind., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15992) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Evansville College, at Evansville, Ind., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 15993) providing for cooperation between the United States and State Governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BAER: A bill (H. R. 15995) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cando, N. Dak., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15996) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Kindred, N. Dak., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 578) that the Speaker appoint a committee of seven Members of the House to inquire into the official conduct of John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SWIFT: Resolution (H. Res. 579) to pay one month's additional compensation for clerk hire to Members not elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: Resolution (H. Res. 580) directing the Attorney General to furnish the House of Representatives certain information in regard to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines wearing the uniform after their discharge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River for the passage of ocean-going vessels into the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, favoring the naming of the Panama Canal the Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to the matter of freight rates on materials for public works; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, requesting the Federal Government to pay at least six months' salary to every soldier, sailor, and marine upon his return to civil life; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the establishment of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to matters of freight rates on materials for public works; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the establishment of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, opposing Government ownership of telegraph and telephone lines and favoring their return to private ownership; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KETTNER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the plan recommended by the Hon. F. K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, for the placing of returning soldiers upon farms; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MANN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, urging payment of at least six months' salary to soldiers, sailors, and marines upon their discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the establishment of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the establishment of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, opposing the St. Lawrence Ship Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, protesting against legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario to make it navigable for ocean-going vessels; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to the value and importance of an adequate system of highways; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. WARD introduced a bill (H. R. 15994) for the promotion and retirement of Lieut. Col. Samuel R. Jones, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of citizens of Ives, Wis., favoring converting portion of T. N. T. plant into a zoological garden; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Woman's Fortnightly Club, of Milwaukee, Wis., indorsing Lewis-Raker bill giving rank to nurses connected with the Army of the United States and urging passage of same when it is presented to Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Racine, Rock, and Kenosha Counties, Wis., asking for repeal of postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Board of Control of the Kenosha (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce, asking that the telegraph and telephone lines be returned to their various owners at once; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Kenosha, Wis., for Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Kenosha Retailers' Association, of Kenosha, Wis., indorsing Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of members of the faculty of the high school at Kenosha, Wis., asking for enactment of Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of officers and employees of J. I. Case Plow Works, Racine, Wis., asking Congress to enact legislation to allow discharged soldiers and sailors six months' extra pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of members of Parent-Teachers' Association of Kenosha, Wis., urging enactment of Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the Daughters of the American Revolution of Kenosha, Wis., urging enactment of Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Logan, W. Va., urging the retention by the Government for a time of the telephone and telegraph lines of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, disapproving the continued exercise of Government control or operation of public utilities, particularly control of wire communication; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of Rotary Club of Mitchell, S. Dak., to change name of the Panama Canal to the Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Alameda County Nurses' Association, indorsing Raker-Lewis bill to grant rank to Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, disapproving the continued Government control or operation of public utilities, especially of wire communication, in this country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pittsburgh Board of Trade, opposing reestablishment of Turkish authority over Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of residents of the city of San Bernardino, headed by Mr. T. Huysing, relative to Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of South Congregational Church Brotherhood, of New Britain, Conn., in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Bernardino Council, No. 1350, Knights of Columbus, of Shelton, Conn., urging the passage by Congress of a resolution requesting President Wilson to bring before the peace conference the question of granting the right of self-government to the people of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Ohio State Board of Education, favoring passage of the Smith-Bankhead bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of woman's committee, Ohio branch, Council of National Defense, asking appropriation for the women in industry service, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of council of the city of Chicago, concerning compensation for honorably discharged soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Illinois Nurserymen's Association, indorsing action of Federal horticultural board in re quarantine No. 37; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of citizens of Holland, Mich., for the withdrawal of the United States soldiers in Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 106 citizens of the State of Michigan, for the enactment of a law providing for the Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of 73 citizens of Indiana, urging passage of bill similar or identical with House bill 10550, providing for national ownership and Government operation of all railroads within the territory of the United States and its possessions, necessary for the furnishing to the people of the United States, including all lands, terminals, and equipments required or desirable for successful operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of bean growers of southern California, urging the Government to invest not less than \$20,000,000 in beans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of citizens of Penryn, Las Molinas, Rocklin, and New Castle, Cal., urging the repeal of the zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Ratto, of Jackson, Cal., against the tax of 5 per cent on film rentals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Anderson and Wood Theater, Redding, Cal., against the proposed tax of 5 per cent on film rentals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Division No. 4, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Providence, R. I., favoring self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Business Men's Association of Pottstown, Pa., favoring a reasonable period to allow for the necessary preparation and adjustment by the owners of the great wire system under Federal control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 16, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BUTLER].

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father!

That God which ever lives and loves,
One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves,

We thank Thee that the door of the holy of holies is ever open to Thy children, where they can commune with Thee, find inspiration to guide them in the duties of life, consolation for their sorrows, solace for the loss of loved ones, and everlasting hope.

We meet here to-day in memory of four great men, who wrought on the floor of this House for their constituents, their respective States, and the Nation they loved.

May those who knew them best speak from their hearts, that their records may be left in the archives of the Nation they loved, that others may read and be inspired with patriotism and devotion.

Comfort those who knew and loved them with the eternal hope that sometime, somewhere, they shall meet them in a land where partings shall be no more and love shall find its own; and everlasting praise be Thine, through Him who demonstrated that life is stronger than death. Amen.